

The
Christian Remembrancer

VOL- 32. Part-1

1856

Sas.
Librarian

Uttarpara Joykrishna Public Library
Govt. of West Bengal



CONTENTS

OF

No. XCIII.

	PAGE
ART. I.—Lectures on the History of France. By the Right Hon. Sir James Stephen, K.C.B., LL.D., Professor of Modern History in the University of Cambridge. In Two Volumes.....	1
II.—1. Judgment pronounced in the Consistory Court of London by the Right Hon. S. Lushington, LL.D., &c.	
2. A Letter to the Right Hon. Dr. Lushington, &c. By Henry Lord Bishop of Exeter.	
3. Strictures, Legal and Historical, on the Judgment of the Consistory Court of London, in December, 1855, in the Case of Westerton v. Liddell, &c. By John David Chambers, M.A., Recorder of New Sarum.....	27
III.—1. History of England from the Fall of Wolsey to the Death of Elizabeth. By James Anthony Froude, M.A. Vols. I. and II.	
2. The Annals of England: an Epitome of English History, from Contemporary Writers, the Rolls of Parliament, and other Public Records. Vol. I.	64

ART. IV.—1. Popular Astronomy. By François Arago, Perpetual Secretary of the Academy of Sciences. Translated from the Original and Edited by Admiral W. H. Smyth, D.C.L., For. Sec. R. S. &c., and Robert Grant, Esq. M.A., F.R.A.S. In Two Volumes. Vol. I.	
2. Outlines of Astronomy. By Sir John F. W. Herschel, Bart., K.H., &c. Fourth Edition	103
V.—1. Memoir of the Rev. W. H. Hewitson, late Minister of the Free Church of Scotland at Dirleton. By the Rev. John Baillie. Fifth Edition.	
2. A Memoir of Adelaide Leper Newton. By the Rev. John Baillie, Minister of the Free Church of Scotland, Hanover Square. Third Edition.	
&c. &c.	141
VI.—The Primitive Doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration. By J. B. Mozley, B.D., Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford	199
<hr/>	
NOTICES OF BOOKS	257

052
CHR.
VOL. 32 (1856)
P. 11.

THE

CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER.

JULY, 1856.

ART. I. *Lectures on the History of France.* By the Right Hon. SIR JAMES STEPHEN, K.C.B., LL.D., Professor of Modern History in the University of Cambridge. 2 vols. Second Edition. Longmans.

WE may fairly anticipate the inquiry,—for what reason do we propose to enter upon a criticism of the Historical Lectures of Sir James Stephen, after the considerable interval that has elapsed since the date of their publication? We reply, that we had, until lately, been content to read the periods of history to which they refer, in the writings of elder authors, in whose wisdom and fidelity experience had led us to confide. We had learnt the chronicles of the Carlovingian age from the pen of Eginhard, of Alcuin, of Anségise, and of Thégan. We had been satisfied with the rich collection of historic memoirs which had illuminated the annals of the House of Bourbon. And we had sought for more general considerations upon the history of France in the laborious compilations of Sismondi, in the earnest reflections of Thierry, and in the solid philosophy of Guizot. An accident, however, lately directed our attention to certain passages in these Lectures, which led to a general perusal of the work; and it has been the result, of this general perusal to impress us with the expediency of bringing under the consideration of the literary world the merits of a treatise which not simply aims at historical narration, but addresses itself, with the stamp of academical and professorial authority, to the special attention of the young. The Lectures of Sir James Stephen, moreover, have been republished in a second edition; and its author has lately received, in addition to his professorship at Cambridge, the office of Examiner in Modern History for the Indian Civil Service. It is therefore a matter of public importance, to which private considerations must yield,

that an accurate apprehension should be formed of the merits of a work which appears to be designed as a permanent text-book, at once for England and for India.

In the first instance, we are compelled to advert to the preface, or dedicatory epistle, which Sir James has addressed to Dr. Whewell, the Master of Trinity. He here offers a defence against the charge,—first, of ‘lecturing prematurely,’ and secondly, ‘of precipitate publication.’ On the one hand, he informs us, that the necessities of the University had compelled him to an immediate assumption of his duties, in opposition to the advice shrewdly offered by Mr. Macaulay to the new Professor, ‘to prepare himself attentively for two or three years.’ On the other, he observes, the alleged ignorance of his audience respecting the French language, and the absence of any text-book from our own, rendered a ‘precipitate publication’ essential to the welfare of the academical system. What fair objection, then, he implies, can be raised to the imperfections of his work?

To this we reply, first, that if Sir James Stephen, on his appointment to the office of Professor, had found himself unequal to an adequate discharge of the duties which it involved, it was competent to him to have surrendered the office into other hands. Secondly, that while he was in no manner restricted in the choice of a subject, the interval between his appointment, and the date of the present edition of his Lectures, involved a yet greater period than that of ‘two or three years,’ which Mr. Macaulay had described. Thirdly, that the expediency, if existing, of the publication of a text-book in the English language, could form no justification of a total misrepresentation of history. Fourthly, that, in point of fact, the text-books which have since been recommended by authority in the University of Cambridge, are not English, but continue to be French; and, lastly, that the publication of these ‘Lectures’ in London, places them within the ordinary class of contributions to general literature. It is obvious, therefore, that the plea upon which it is proposed to exempt the present work from the public right of critical analysis is untenable; and that it is as fairly amenable as any other to praise or to condemnation, according to the accuracy of its statements, and the justice of its reasoning.

It is not our intention to enter upon a discussion of all the four-and-twenty lectures which Sir James has here submitted to the public. The selections, however, shall be fairly and indifferently made. We will take, then, in the first place, the description which the Lecturer has offered of ‘the Character and Influence of Charlemagne.’

This subject naturally divides itself into the character of the individual, the genius of his public policy, and the influence of his achievements upon succeeding ages. Now we readily concede to Sir James Stephen whatever merit may attach to the fact that these Lectures are written in a forcible and happy style. But the relation of this certain felicity of style to the facts and opinions which it serves to clothe, is analogous to the description which Milton has bequeathed to us of rhyme,—that it was ‘the invention of a barbarous age to set off wretched matter and lame metre.’ For under such a guise, the author contrives to tell us nothing of which the most juvenile reader could have been ignorant before, either as to the personal life of Charlemagne, or the distinctive characteristics of his reign. Of that, indeed, which is erroneous, there is much at which Eginhard himself would have stared aghast. But of that which is true, there is nothing either important in fact or novel in opinion; nor is there any characterisation of the Austrasian monarch which would not apply, with equal force, to any other chieftain placed in such circumstances as his. Secondly, Sir James appears to have consulted no other ancient authority than the Monk of St. Gall. The stories which he has adduced from that writer, who was no contemporary of Charlemagne, are at least of very questionable authenticity: while the records of Eginhard and others, who *were* contemporaries of the Carolingian chief, and whose writings the Lecturer too plainly shows that he has never consulted, stand foremost in point of authority, and are yet more circumstantial in point of detail.

In describing the characters of Clovis and Charlemagne, it appears to be the aim of Sir James Stephen to place himself in a successful antagonism to Gibbon, and to lower the one and exalt the other from the respective standards which he alleges to have been assigned to them by that historian. That our readers may be able to adjudicate between the historian of the Roman empire, and the academical professor, we will endeavour to place before them several of the points at issue. We will speak first of Charlemagne, and afterwards of Clovis.

We will advert then, primarily, to the question of the fanaticism, or proselytism of the sword, which has been asserted by Gibbon, and has been denied by Sir James Stephen, to have constituted a feature of the policy of Charlemagne. Let the latter writer state his own position.

‘It has been alleged, indeed, that the Saxon wars were waged in a spirit of fanaticism, and that the Vicar of Christ placed the sword of Mahomet in the hands of the sovereign of the Franks. It is, I think, an unfounded charge, though sanctioned by Gibbon and Warburton, and by names of perhaps even greater authority than theirs. That the alternative,

"believe or die," was sometimes proposed by Charlemagne to the Saxons, I shall not indeed dispute. But it is not less true that, before these terms were tendered to them, they had *again and again* rejected his less formidable proposal, "be quiet and live." In form and in terms, indeed, their election lay between the gospel and the sword. In substance and in reality, they had to make their choice between submission and destruction.—Vol. i. pp. 91, 92.

Now we ask, upon what ground does Sir James Stephen proceed to offer this gratuitous contradiction of the statements of preceding writers? Where is the evidence (for he offers none) in support of his assertion, that the Saxons 'had again and again' rejected a policy of submission at the hands of Charlemagne, before they were subjected to a policy of fanaticism? Independently of this primary evidence, is there no indirect or ancillary testimony to be obtained upon the question?

It is one of the most striking instances of the illogical habit of generalization which pervades this work, that the author ascribes to one single moving cause nearly every act of Charlemagne. To the aim of extending a political organization, he refers almost every feature in the life of the monarch, with an uniformity from which the various impulses and infirmities of human nature must necessarily recoil, in actual life. It is scarcely surprising, therefore, that this apparent subordination of history to preconceived theories, should lead to important errors in fact.

In the first place, then, the career of Charlemagne was marked from the very outset (as we shall proceed to show), by a dominant spirit of proselytism by force. There is no evidence to support the assumption that any such system of warfare was conducted by his predecessor. With the accession of Charlemagne to undivided power, in 772, the belligerent policy of the Carlovingian House assumed a new shape. It was then for the first time seriously turned against the Saxons. Yet in the records of that very year we find that Charlemagne at once announced to the Assembly of Worms his intention of invading Saxony, and actually proceeded to the immediate and spontaneous subversion of the Saxon rites.

This is evinced at once in the '*Vita Caroli Magni Imperatoris Augusti, per Eginhardum Scripta*,' and also in the '*Annales*' of the same author. We quote from the latter.

'Rex vero Carolus, congregato apud Wormaciam generali conventu, Saxoniam bello aggredi statuit, eamque sine morâ ingressus, ferro et igne omnia depopulatus, Eresburgum castrum cepit, Idolum quod Irminsul à Saxonibus vocatur, evertit. In cujus destructione cum in eodem loco per triduum moraretur, &c.'—*Egin. Annales*, DCCLXXII.

What, then, becomes of the assertion of the Professor, that

'a long and deplorable experience had already shown that the Frankish people had neither peace nor security to expect for a single year, so long as their Saxon neighbours retained their heathen rites?' (P. 92.) It is true, no doubt, that the aim of Charlemagne would have been more effectually attained, if the moral dominion of the Church over the Saxon people had been added to the physical dominion of the Carlovingian sword. Such a course, indeed, would have been suggested by the plainest and coarsest views of political expediency. But it has been seen that the initiative of the war between Charlemagne and the Saxons, both virtually and actually, sprang altogether from the former; that his military fanaticism, which is described as arising from 'a long and deplorable experience,' was altogether spontaneous and instinctive,—that the first manifestation of this policy by the Franks was coincident with the first year of his accession to undivided power,—and that the assertion of Sir James Stephen is thus decisively contradicted by contemporary records.

So much, then, for the statement, first, that fanaticism formed no part of the belligerent policy of Charlemagne, and secondly, that his religious propagandism formed only a later phase of his career. Let us now inquire whether there is any greater accuracy in the assertion of the Lecturer that this fanaticism had not embraced the alternative of conversion or of extermination, until the Saxons 'had again and again rejected his less formidable proposal to be quiet and live.'

Now we have seen the conduct of Charlemagne in his *very first relations* with the Saxon people, characterised by his own chronicler and personal friend, in the words '*ferro et igne cuncta depopulatus*.' This spontaneous conduct is certainly a very singular illustration of a permission 'to be quiet and live!' In the very next succeeding encounter of the conqueror with the Saxon race, we find him adopting the fanatical policy of the Arabian Chiefs:—

'Cum Rex in Villâ Carisiaco hiemaret, consilium iniit, ut perfidam et fœdifragam Saxonum gentem bello aggrediretur, et eo usque perseveraret, dum aut victi Christianæ religioni subicerentur, aut omnino tollerentur.'
—Egin. *Annales*, DCCLXXV.

The first invasion of the Saxons by Charlemagne—a gratuitous infraction of their national rights—had taken place in 772. The interval had been chiefly spent by the conqueror in the subjugation of the Lombards. The Saxons had meanwhile risen in 774, against the Carlovingian yoke. Certain terms had been enforced upon them by Charlemagne, at the close of the first campaign. Against these terms the Saxons, who had submitted to them in an hour of necessity, had afterwards not unnaturally rebelled. The complaint of Eginhard,

that the Saxons had broken the Treaty of 772, must, therefore, be received with caution, as the view at once of a writer imbued with the traditions of Frankish conquest, and a courtier of Aix-la-Chapelle. There is no sufficient reason to suppose that the existence of Saxon rights was at that time incompatible with the growth of Frankish civilisation; and the alternative thus offered by Charlemagne to the invaded people, after conquest had trampled on their liberties, was, therefore, as monstrous an aggression as would have been a similar decree, offering to the Prussian people an alternative between extermination and a continued recognition of the Continental System, if promulgated by Napoleon in 1813.

We have seen, then, that Charlemagne at first invaded Saxony in the double character of an aggressor and iconoclast; that he subjected the conquered people, after a gratuitous desolation of their soil, to conditions which no view of national rights could have rendered legitimate or just; and that he availed himself of their very first attempt at retaliation as a pretext for enforcing upon them the choice between extermination and religious conversion.

But apart from this decisive contradiction of the statement of Sir James Stephen, the fanatical spirit which pervaded the Carolingian conquest is rendered sufficiently apparent by the fact, that it continued to survive after it had proved itself wholly ineffectual as an agent in the establishment of civil dominion. Persecution naturally developed its fruit in hypocrisy; and the manner in which the sacrament of baptism was extended to unbelieving infidels, by the conqueror's command, only instils at this day another sense of gratitude for the Divine preservation of Christian truth amidst the traditionary profanations of the civil power. 'Maxima eorum multitudo,' says Eginhard of the Saxons in the year 780, 'in loco qui Orheim appellatur, solitâ simulatione baptizata est.' Ann. DCCCLXXX. The fictitious and successive conversions of the Saxon race in no degree tended to their subordination; and baptism, which became a badge of religious hypocrisy, was received by them as the alternative of destruction, as often as they were vanquished by their Frankish oppressors.

But conceding even the accuracy of the facts adduced by Sir James Stephen, the internal evidence arising from the religious policy which the Conqueror sought to impose, conclusively shows that Christianity could not have been introduced among the Saxons with that view of mitigating their moral barbarism, which the author regards as the keystone in the religious policy of Charlemagne. The tariff of religious expiations which that warrior introduced was compounded of the vilest superstition and

the most hideous morality. Human sacrifices are unquestionably the most debasing, the most barbarising practices that have ever formed attributes of heathen ritual. Yet these very human sacrifices—as we learn from Gaillard, and the elaborate author of the '*Corpus Historiæ Germanicæ*'—received the sanction of Charlemagne, subject only to the expiation of penance. (Gaillard. II. p. 241—7. Struv.: *Corp. Hist. Germ.* 133.)¹ Apart, then, from all considerations of morality, of consistency, and of justice, what shall we say for the 'humanising influence' of a system which, while it prescribed death as the alternative of baptism, tolerated the most systematic murder—the most barbarous relic of a heathen faith—the religious feature of all others the most antagonistic to the Christian dispensation—as one of the lightest and most venial sins? Such then, in fact, was the policy which Sir James Stephen represents as an endeavour to abolish 'the ferocious barbarism inseparable from heathen rites!' Such, again, was the 'humanising influence,' as the Lecturer tells us, of the religious system which Charlemagne imported into Saxony!

We will pass, then, to another attribute of the character of Charlemagne. It shall be the question of the cruelty of his government. The Frankish conqueror is everywhere represented by Sir James Stephen, not only as a civilised and intellectual, but as a benign ruler, who resorted to no acts of harshness or oppression, beyond such as were absolutely essential to the preservation of his government, or were justifiable by such principles of public law as were then recognised in Europe. Sir James has told us, in his Preface, that a lecturer does not aim at the dignity of a historian. But we think a lecturer might, at any rate, aim at the dignity of truth. The conduct of Charlemagne towards the Saxons was uniformly characterised by a wanton ferocity, of which the barbaric reign of Clovis itself—with which Sir James affects to contrast the alleged civilisation of Charlemagne—affords no example. The decapitation, in cold blood, of four or five thousand vanquished enemies, of whom it was at least doubtful whether they had not a superior claim to that even of prisoners of war, was an act of barbarism such as has not often stained the Mahometan annals. Thus, on the triumph of Charlemagne over Witikind, we learn from Eginhard:—

'Et cum omnes Witokindum hujus sceleris auctorem proclamarent, eum tamen tradere nequirent, eo quod re perpetrata ad Nortmannos se contulerat; cæterorum, qui persuasioni ejus morem gerentes tantum

¹ These references to Gaillard and Struvius are also made by Gibbon. Ed. Milman. ix. p. 175. It is, therefore, the more surprising that the facts to which they relate should not have been considered by the Professor.

'*facinus peregerunt, usque ad quatuor millia quingenti traditi, et super Alarum fluvium, in loco qui Orheim appellatur, jussu regis omnes und die decollati sunt.*'—*Annales*, DCCLXXXV.

The words 'scelus' and 'facinus' are, of course, to be understood with the same reservation as the remarks of Eginhard on the breach of the Treaty of 772. But even independently of this qualification, nearly the whole 'scelus' and 'facinus' involved in the warlike attitude of the Saxons lay, by the confession of Eginhard himself, with their chieftain, Witikind.

We might multiply these quotations, but will quote only the following, in addition to the above:—

Vita Caroli Magni: Cap. xx.

'Facta est et alia prius contra eum in Germaniâ valida conjuratio, cujus auctores, *partim luminibus orbat, partim membris incolumes, omnes tamen exilio, deportati sunt.*'

These quotations may suffice to illustrate the spirit which characterised the wars of Charlemagne. We have now, at least, placed our readers in a position to judge between the statements of Eginhard and those of Sir James Stephen. If the whole history of barbarian warfare can attest acts of greater ferocity than this wholesale slavery and mutilation, or than the simultaneous murder of thousands of defeated foes, the Lecturer may perhaps be able, in some slight degree, to relieve by contrast, the monstrous inaccuracies of his portraiture of Charlemagne. But until such instances can be found, he must be prepared, at least, to acquiesce in the conviction of Gibbon, that 'that sovereign's treatment of the vanquished Saxons was an abuse of the right of conquest.'

Sir James Stephen is scarcely more happy or more accurate in his characterisation of the military tactics of Charlemagne: 'Imitating the policy of Cæsar,' he tells us, 'and anticipating that of Napoleon, Charlemagne made war support itself.' And this feature of his tactics is described as a leading idiosyncrasy in the character of the conqueror. The assertion in question, however, simply implies a total misconception both of the character of the wars which were waged in the eighth and ninth centuries, and of the civilisation which they embodied. The narration bequeathed to us by Eginhard, of nearly every campaign of that period, contains the expression, '*totum ferro et igne vastavit.*' This was certainly a very singular anticipation of the principles adopted either in the German or the Italian campaigns of Napoleon! To assert that it was the practice of an invader to 'make war support itself,' is, in other words, to assert that it was his practice to disregard the rights of private property.* And what a truism is this, when not only

were those rights disregarded for the sustenance of the army, but when the very subjects of those rights—when the very property itself—was, by almost undeviating practice, put to fire and sword!

But the Lecturer proceeds, in the next sentence, to say, that 'Neither in his (Charlemagne's) capitularies, nor in the chronicles of his reign, is there any proof or suggestion that his troops ever received or expected any pay or military allowances.' If the analogy between the policy of Charlemagne and that of Napoleon is here intended to apply, the Lecturer is once more in error. If, on the other hand, he merely states the abstract proposition as a peculiarity of the reign of Charlemagne, he shows a similar misconception of the general character both of the military system of mediæval Europe, and of the monetary condition of society by which that system was necessitated. The whole of this comparison, indeed, is characterised by a strange confusion of the policy of Napoleon—which, in his early campaigns, in great measure disencumbered his army of the transport of provisions—and of the policy of barbaric and feudal Europe, which almost wholly excluded the notion of allowances from its military systems. A subsistence upon spoil was an inevitable incident of such a system of warfare; and it was in no greater degree originated by Charlemagne than by any other warrior of barbaric France. If, then, it were not the custom of Charlemagne to establish a system of military allowances, what possible distinctiveness, in this respect, is there in his policy? If, again, it were his custom to carry universal destruction by fire and sword, what possible analogy, in this respect, exists between his policy and that of Napoleon?

We are scarcely less startled by the surprising inaccuracies in subordinate matters of fact, which crowd the pages of these Essays, on the part of a writer who affects so much historical precision. We will offer a few instances. Sir James Stephen tells us (p. 45), 'To Charles (Martel) eventually succeeded Pepin.' Now it happens that Pepin immediately succeeded his father Charles, and he did so in conjunction with his brother Carloman. It would be difficult to imagine any isolated statement contained in so few words, and yet so calculated to mislead the reader on the important question of the principles of the Carolingian succession.

Again: he tells us, in the same page, that Childeric III., and with him the Merovingian dynasty, were deposed by Pope Zachary. If he had referred to the opening sentence in the *Vita Caroli Imperatoris*, he would have found that this deposition was the work of Pope Stephen:—

‘Gens Merovingorum, de quâ Franci reges sibi creare soliti erant, usque in Hildericum regem, qui jussu Stephani, Romani Pontificis, depositus ac detonsus, atque in Monasterium missus est, durasse putatur.’—*Vita Car. Imp.* c. 1.

Eginhard, it is true, records elsewhere (see ‘*Annales*’) an opinion of Zachary on an abstract question, as to the relative claims of sovereignty by real and nominal rulers; and this opinion Sir James Stephen has apparently twisted into an ordinance for the deposition of Childeric. But we cannot go on chronicling such inaccuracies as these.

The contrast, then, appears sufficiently broad to those who turn from the pages of Sir James Stephen to the boundless comprehension and perspicuity which characterise the historical views of M. Guizot. But we have a heavier complaint than that of negative deficiencies against the Cambridge Professor. We have to call upon him to explain, if he can, his grievous distortions of the pages of Gibbon. We will turn, then, to his character of Clovis, which Sir James Stephen, while he professes to describe it in direct and triumphant opposition to the views of Gibbon, takes, nevertheless, almost literally from the words of that writer himself. There is something in this factitious originality—a false brilliancy of all others the least agreeable—which cannot be too much regretted.

Sir James Stephen complains, then, that in Gibbon’s *History*, as well as in the French writers, ‘Clovis and Clotaire sweep across the historic stage in the garb and character of heroes. Their campaigns are depicted in colours brilliant enough to reflect the glories of Napoleon. The doctrines of Aristotle and Montesquieu are invoked to interpret to us the enigmas of their policy; and the revolutions of their kingdom are announced in terms such as might fitly celebrate the overthrow of the empire of the Cæsars.’

First, then, these ‘brilliant colours,’ as we shall see, exist in the Lecturer’s imagination. Secondly, Sir James has apparently mistaken the appeals made by Gibbon to Montesquieu *on matters of fact*, regarding the laws and customs of the Merovingian age, for an invocation of the doctrines of that writer in interpreting the ‘enigmas’ of the Merovingian policy. Thirdly, the asserted magniloquence of Gibbon in describing the revolutions of the Merovings, will be conceded, by any reader of that historian, to be an unqualified misconception of fact.

Sir James then proceeds, in defence of his criticism, and in illustration of his simulated antagonism to Gibbon, to give his own description of the character of Clovis. That our readers may observe the true relation of this description to the views which

it professes to assail, we give the two statements in juxtaposition:—

Sir James Stephen.

¹ 'Clovis was an untutored savage.
² *In peace and in war his hands were ever stained with blood.* ³ At the close of his reign, he assassinated every chief of his tribe from whom his children had any rivalry to apprehend.'

Again:—

⁴ 'The most pathetic and heart-subduing motives of the religion which he had embraced, were insufficient to tame his ferocity. ⁵ Even the evangelical narrative of the sacrifice drew from him no other than the exclamation, "Si ego ibidem cum Frankis meis fuisset, injurias ejus vindicasset!"'—*Lectures on Hist. of France*, vol. i. pp. 52, 53.

Gibbon.

¹ 'His ambitious reign was a perpetual violation of moral and Christian duties. ² *His hands were stained with blood in peace as well as in war.* ³ And as soon as Clovis had dismissed a synod of the Gallican Church, he calmly assassinated all the princes of the Merovingian race.'

Again:—

⁴ 'But the savage conqueror of Gaul was incapable of examining the proofs of a religion which depends on the laborious investigation of historic evidence and speculative theology. He was still more incapable of feeling the mild influence of the Gospel, which persuades and purifies the heart of a genuine convert.'

⁵ And (in a note to the same page), 'Si ego ibidem cum Frankis meis fuisset, injurias ejus vindicasset.'"—*Gibbon's Rom. Emp.*—Ed. Milman, vol. vi. p. 302.

Such are the obligations of Sir James Stephen to a writer whom he delights to assail for his 'revolting obscenities' (p. 89), for his 'offensive levity,' for his 'disingenuous' conduct. It certainly strikes us as the reverse of an ingenuous action, to enrich oneself by appropriating another's reflections, and then to disparage his celebrity.

A word more on the subject of Clovis, and we have done with it. The claim of that warrior, which the Lecturer denies, to be accounted a hero, is an independent question. But the denial of such a claim proceeds upon totally false principles of characterisation. If the development of human character be influenced by social condition, the claim of a 'hero' must be adjudged by his relation to the standard of civilisation which has existed in his age. Thus, if Napoleon had committed the actions of Clovis, he could not have been deemed a hero. If Clovis had committed the actions of Napoleon, his character would have been, not heroic, but supernatural. Clovis was probably as far removed above the average intellectual standard of the fifth century, as was Napoleon above that of the nineteenth. If Clovis 'assassinated many of the chiefs of his tribe,' the civilized Constantine assassinated his own son. If the

'ferocity' of Clovis were not tamed by his religion, Charlemagne decapitated four or five thousand of his prisoners in a single day. If Clovis were not the legislator of his people (p. 58)—a conclusion which is drawn chiefly from the account given by Tacitus of German institutions as they existed several centuries before him—the fact would be scarcely more essential to the maintenance of the present position, than the 'Capitularies' to the heroic character of Charlemagne, or than the 'Code' to that of Napoleon. On the whole, then, we are compelled to state, in regard to this sketch of the character of Clovis—if we may paraphrase the happy saying of George IV. in reference to Mr. Moore's *Life of Sheridan*—that we cannot admit that Sir James Stephen has murdered Clovis, but he has certainly 'attempted his life!'

It will be a relief to pass to some other subject. We will take, then, the causes adduced by Sir James Stephen, of the Decline and Fall of the Merovingian and Carlovingian Dynasties.

The leading cause assigned by him to these events is, emphatically, 'Barbarism.' And this 'Barbarism' he clearly, no doubt, and reasonably, defines as a condition of society in which Government is sustained, not by a moral agency, but by physical force. But it is another evidence of the tendency to generalization, and of the want of analysis, which we have before remarked, that a vague and abstract influence is set forth as operating upon a definite entity, without any adequate view of the application of such a generic and unsystematised agent to the special character of the entity in question.

To assert that 'Barbarism,' or a Government of physical force, was the necessary cause of the decline of the elder and the younger dynasty, is, in effect, to assert the general proposition, that dynastic security cannot exist without a national civilisation. Now it is very doubtful, we think, whether the anti-monarchical influences of civilisation are not at least equally powerful with the anti-monarchical influences of barbarism. The inductive and the internal presumptions, indeed, are strongly in favour of their superior potency. It may safely be asserted, on the one hand, that dynasties, under a state of barbarism, have been more often durable; and that, under a state of civilisation, they have been more often transient. On the other hand, it is the genius of civilisation to produce liberty; and it is the genius of liberty—a truth which is illustrated in almost every other history than our own, if not in our own also—to resist Monarchy. Moreover, this 'Barbarism,' in the abstract character in which it is here adduced by Sir James Stephen, must have proved as great an obstacle to the dynastic

security of the local chieftains, who by degrees became virtually independent sovereigns, as to that of the Merovingian and Carolingian princes themselves. 'If the 'barbarism of Clovis' and his successors rendered them incapable of establishing a 'moral dominion, and therefore incapable of establishing an 'enduring dominion,' (p. 144.)—this influence must apply, irrespectively of a difference in the extent of dominion, which often constituted the only real distinction between the powers of royalty and those of its nominal vassals. And yet the rule of the latter was, for the most part, both durable and strong. This theory, therefore, is one which would furnish an explanation for the overthrow of every dynasty in uncivilised countries on a common principle,—and that principle, too, at issue with fact.

What insight, then, does Sir James Stephen give us into the political character of the Merovingian and Carolingian ages? The chief immediate cause of the decline of the dynasties in question was, beyond controversy, the genius of aristocratic usurpation. Now the lecturer cannot *identify* this aristocratic usurpation with a state of barbarism—a process which is essential to the success of his theory. For such an identification would imply that national barbarism must prevail where an aristocracy stands in systematic antagonism to the crown. Such a theory would involve the barbarism of France so late as the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries; and would therefore apply, with similar force, to the later dominion of the House of Valois, one of the most 'enduring' of the dynasties of Europe. Again, the decline of the Holy Roman Empire was caused by a progressive aristocratic usurpation. Yet Germany was, at the time of the dissolution of that Empire, at the height of her civilisation. Hence, therefore, although the two principles may co-exist, and be occasionally produced, the one by the agency of the other, they do not admit of identification.

Thus, Sir James Stephen's theory repudiates itself. The Crown was subverted, not by the people, but by a quasi-sovereign aristocracy. The same principle must, therefore, apply to this quasi-sovereign aristocracy itself, which was a durable aristocracy. Hence the impossibility 'of establishing a moral dominion' could *not* involve the impossibility 'of establishing an enduring dominion.'

Here, then, applies the ingenious theory of M. Guizot, that the infancy of civilisation rendered extensive social and political relations impossible for any long period of time. Hence, the unity of great states was impossible, and those states accordingly became divided. The decline of the Merovingian dynasty was caused, not by its own barbarism, nor that of the Carolingian by the abstract fact of the barbarism of its subjects, as Sir

James Stephen would argue; but by the extent of its dominion. Those dynasties, then, fell, not because they had only a dominion of force—for the aristocracy themselves had no other—but because close relations were impossible in extensive states. 'Charlemagne,' says M. Guizot (we give merely the substance of his remarks), 'endeavoured to make a great people an extensive state. The condition of the country was not adapted to such a policy; and with his successors there was soon neither king nor nation.' The rise of social order with the age of Charlemagne forms, as this eminent writer asserts, the distinctive attribute of that age.

'Sans doute,' he elsewhere observes, 'l'Empire de Charlemagne se dissout; mais il se dissout en états particuliers La forme a changé; mais, au fond, l'œuvre est restée.'—*Lect. xx. Hist. Gen. de la Civ. de l'Europe.*

Sir James Stephen, on the other hand, asserts that the career of France, from the age of Charlemagne to that of Hugh Capet, was marked by a *retrogressive* barbarism. So much, then, for the venerable illusion of the civilising influence of Charlemagne upon succeeding ages! This assertion he rests upon evidence deduced from legends in a few hagiologies, and from the superstitious character of the intervening period. We answer, first, in respect to the hagiologies, that it is impossible, even conceding the authenticity of their representations, to found an induction upon such scanty and partial evidence; and that the irruptions of the Normans, during the period in question—a fact wholly independent of the social condition of France—will in itself account for much of that increase of fortification which Sir James Stephen takes for an evidence of increasing barbarism. Secondly, that the increase of religious superstition in this period, forms an evidence of exactly the reverse of increasing 'barbarism,' in the sense in which the Lecturer explains that term. For superstition is essentially an engine of moral dominion; and he defines 'barbarism' as a condition where there can be only physical dominion. It may not be a means of moral dominion of a high character; but as national changes from barbarism to civilisation must be conducted by the slowest gradations, so the introduction of the lower elements of moral dominion must be held in evidence of national progress from barbarism towards civilisation. The essential difference of these two theories is sufficiently obvious. The clear perception of M. Guizot convinced him that any other hypothesis was encompassed with insurmountable difficulty; and although the desire of Sir James Stephen for the display of a little originality of thought evinces a commendable ambition, the adoption of M. Guizot's theory would clearly have offered a wiser and a safer course.

Let us pass, then, to a later period of the History of France. We will select the chapter on the 'Anti-feudal Influence of the Eastern Crusades.' This essay professes to investigate at once the causes and the consequences of these movements, the springs of action which called them into birth, and the influence which they ultimately developed upon the Feudal System. We advert to the views advocated in this chapter with the less reluctance, because—although there are some points from which we are prepared to dissent, and more which (if we had the necessary space) we should be ready to supply—the chapter in question displays more considerate thought, and less indisposition to rigorous analysis, than many of the other lectures which aim at philosophical investigation.

We will take, first, the causes of the Crusades. The springs of action which the Lecturer detects in this mighty movement are, first, those which he terms 'worldly'; and secondly, those which, although he does not characterise them under any special definition, we may regard as 'moral':—

'Nothing is more easy than to detect the worldly motives which impelled the ruder population of the Western World to roll in eight successive and desolating torrents towards the shores of Africa and the East. The Crusader received a plenary indulgence; that is, the remission of all the penances by which, as he believed, his sins must otherwise have been expiated, either in the present life, or in purgatory. During his absence, the Church became the protector of his wife, his children, and his estate. Whoever might injure them was declared excommunicate, *ipso facto*, without any further sentence. His debts ceased to bear interest from the day of his departure, even though he had bound himself by an oath to the payment of them. He was authorized to postpone, till the lapse of three years, the full payment of any debt that was then actually due. If his estate had been mortgaged, he was entitled to receive the whole produce of it, during the first year of his crusade, without any deduction for the benefit of his creditor. He was exempted from the payment of any talle which might be imposed upon his lands during his absence; and finally, he might insist upon receiving from his parents a tenth of their income for his own support.'—Vol. I. pp. 185, 186.

This, then, formed the 'worldly' motive. The single inadequacy, however, of such a moving power to the accomplishment of the effect produced, is readily acknowledged by the author. 'It would be a libel on our common nature to ascribe to such causes alone, or chiefly, a movement which during one hundred and fifty successive years agitated every state, and almost every family, in Christendom.' (P. 186.) But the inadequacy of such a motive to the production of such a fact, is obvious from other considerations. Not only would these 'worldly' motives have proved inadequate to the continuous sustentation of such a movement; but they would have proved, in all probability, far more incapable of calling it originally into existence. Thirdly,

052
CHR
Vol. 32 (N.
21.

these worldly considerations could only have addressed themselves, as the Lecturer himself intimates, to a certain portion of the community, and that portion by far the least influential.

We come, then, to the second, or *moral*, cause of the Crusades, according to the view of Sir James Stephen:—

‘The dark mysteries of our existence, though little heeded in our own luxurious and mechanical age, pressed heavily on the spirits of those who lived beneath the tyranny and the gloom of the feudal domination. In their struggle with those inscrutable enigmas of our mortal being, they yielded up their minds to a long succession of superstitious terrors; and the legends of those ages abound with prodigies far more strange than those with which Livy has made us familiar. Men were gazing anxiously on the stars which were ready to fall and crush this antiquated globe. They laid on their own bodies the miraculous impression of the Holy Cross. Nuns and hermits, returning from their cells, alarmed the world with fearful anticipations. The saints, quitting their celestial abodes, reappeared on earth, to disclose to trembling man the awful behests of his Creator. Throughout the whole of Eastern Europe, flagellants exhibited to admiring crowds their self-lacerated bodies.’—Pp. 186, 187.

To this twofold motive, then—the ‘worldly’ and the ‘moral’—Sir James Stephen assigns the institution and sustentation of the Crusades. The statement appears to us unsatisfactory, and the cause defective. To the latter agency the Lecturer would necessarily ascribe the preponderance of motive power; since he confesses the inadequacy of the former so much as ‘chiefly’ to have developed the Crusades. Can we, then, assign to such a moral or religious cause the chief production of such a movement? Would it have sufficed for its maintenance during a period of one hundred and fifty years? If superstition could have wrought, for so long a time, an adequate influence on the ruder classes—which there is good reason to doubt—what degree of influence would it have exerted upon the superior ranks of life, in which the movement of the Crusades must have been mainly directed, after the transient political motives, which might have animated the few, had passed away? Above all, could a superstitious sentiment have originally given birth to this moral and pervading spirit? And if so, can any adequate cause be assigned for its production from religious elements, at a definite epoch, among the many centuries of mediæval superstition; while at that epoch—and at that epoch alone—as we shall see, a new and powerful agency was rising into view?

Here, then, we come to M. Guizot’s definition of the Causes of the Crusades, which he characterises as the moral and the social. To the moral cause, indeed, Sir James Stephen has done justice, and, we suspect, more than justice. But the absence from his lectures of all consideration of the social cause renders his view of this movement essentially defective; and we cannot

but express our surprise that any writer should presume to treat the subject of the Crusades without having considered the views propounded by so deep a philosopher as M. Guizot; or, having done so, that he should have profited so little by their consideration. Crude theories propounded by earlier writers, and more matured reflections from later authors, are in accordance with the laws of nature; nor can we, in such cases, justly complain of the imperfect philosophy which may thus be at first recorded. But Sir James Stephen has inverted the natural order; and instead of adding to a fabric of constructive reasoning, he breaks the chain of progressive thought by introduction of what we can only term, retrogressive reflection.

Let M. Guizot, then, state his view of the magnitude of that social influence which impelled mediæval Europe to the policy of the Crusades:—

‘J’ai cherché à montrer comment les états, les existences, les esprits, s’étaient renfermés dans un horizon fort étroit. Ainsi le régime féodal avait prévalu. Au bout de quelque temps, un horizon si borné ne suffit plus; la pensée et l’activité humaine aspirèrent à déposer la sphère où elles étaient renfermées. La vie errante avait cessé; mais non le goût de son mouvement, des aventures. Les peuples se précipitèrent dans les croisades comme dans une nouvelle existence, plus large, plus variée, qui tantôt rappelait l’ancienne liberté de la barbarie, tantôt ouvrait les perspectives d’une vaste avenir.’—*Ilist. Gen. de la Civil. en Europe*, c. 8.

This single quotation will serve very imperfectly to illustrate M. Guizot’s views; and we must refer the reader to the chapter in which it is contained. But it may suffice to imply the marvellous clearness of perception, and the soundness of logical deduction, which has marked this great man’s research into those conditions of society, and those workings of the human mind, which, in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, developed the genius of the Holy Wars. Nor is it possible to resist the conviction, that Sir James Stephen has overlooked the most influential of the causes which he desires to enumerate.

The statement, however, which the Lecturer offers us on the subject of the anti-feudal influences wrought by the Crusades is characterised by greater accuracy, and a nearer approach to completeness of detail. It will not, at least, mislead those whom it is intended to instruct. That, in point of the natural ability it may evince, it will not bear a comparison with the statement of M. Guizot, could scarcely involve a slur on any living author. But that they fall short of the completeness which M. Guizot’s lectures display, is a defect not easily to be condoned in a Professor who might have instructed his pupils in the very terms of the great philosopher of history, without extending the compass of his narration.

We will pass from this subject to a later portion of the
NO. XCIII.—N.S. C

volumes before us; for it may be said that an author is apt to gain caution and reflection, under the experience with which the composition of a work of considerable prolixity must necessarily endow him. We will take, then, Sir James Stephen's disquisition on the relative growth of the English and French monarchies. It is a subject to which it may be fairly supposed that he may have devoted anterior thought and more earnest reflection.

Let us first state the general principles, as arising out of a scheme of Divine Government of the world, to which the Lecturer traces the gradually diverging characteristics of the European nations, as they rose from their primitive barbarism to a state of modern civilisation:—

'I have already avowed my belief, that to each of the nations of the earth belongs, by a divine decree, a *distinctive character* adapted to the peculiar office assigned to each, in the great and comprehensive system of human affairs. Thus, to France was appointed, by the Supreme Ruler of mankind, the duty of *civilising and humanising the European world*. To England it has been given to guide all other states to excellence in the *practical arts of life, to commercial wealth, to political wisdom, and to spiritual liberty*.'—Vol. ii. pp. 473.

In what degree, then, are these attributes distinctive? To France, as we have seen, was assigned the destiny of 'civilising' other nations. Now Civilisation has three principal elements:—the material, the social, and the intellectual. To France, therefore, must be assigned the development of the 'practical arts of life,' as the condition or offspring of material civilisation—of 'commercial wealth,' as the condition or offspring of social civilisation—and of 'political wisdom' and 'spiritual liberty,' as the condition or offspring of intellectual civilisation. But the attributes of these three elements of the 'distinctive characteristic' of France have been asserted to be the 'distinctive characteristics' of England. Hence, the characteristics of England and those of France are identical. And yet they are distinctive. Thus, according to Sir James Stephen, they are at once identical and distinctive!

But this is not all. The author proceeds with his theory in the following words:—

'But to Germany was delegated the highest and the noblest trust that has been committed to any people since the Hebrews, the Greeks, and the Romans fulfilled their respective commissions of imparting to our race the blessings of religion, of learning, and of law. For, in Germany, we revere the *prolific mother of nations, the reformer of a corrupted Christianity, and the conservator of the liberties and independence of the European Commonwealth*.'—P. 473.

First then, it was the idiosyncrasy of Germanic destiny, that Germany should be 'the prolific mother of nations.' This may,

perhaps, be understood either in a physical or a moral sense. In a physical sense, however, the assertion implies a misconception of the plainest canons of ethnology. The assertion, indeed, might be true of the original stem of the great Indo-Germanic race; but in what degree is Germany more nearly identified with that race than many other nations? The only modern nations, in the formation of which the Germanic family can be said to have wrought any considerable influence, are the English and the French. What influence did 'Germany'—and we are not speaking of the wider term of *Teutonism*—exert in the creation of the Slavonic, of the Scandinavian race—of the races of Italy—of the three nations of the Western Peninsula (the Castilian, the Catalan, and the Gallician)—or of twenty others?

If, again, this term be understood in a moral sense, it could only relate to the civilising influence of Germany over Europe. But this distinctive attribute of Germany has been already claimed as the distinctive attribute, first of France, and then of England.

Again: the Lecturer gives us a list of the moral qualities appertaining to Germany—in contradistinction with the moral qualities of France and England—and so appertaining because they have formed the traditional attributes of the Teutonic mind. But he tells us that (pp. 487, 495) the elements of the national mind of England have also been always those of the Teutonic mind. Therefore, the moral qualities which are German in contradistinction with English are also German in common with English!

Secondly, it was the idiosyncrasy of Germanic destiny, that Germany should be 'the reformer of a corrupted Christianity.' Now, Sir James Stephen has said that it was the exclusive destiny of England to 'guide all other states to spiritual liberty.' Spiritual liberty and reformed Christianity are not, indeed, identical in the abstract. But it is certain, at least, that the chief means by which this country 'guided other states to spiritual liberty' were, by 'reforming Christianity.' And it is also certain that Germany, in 'reforming Christianity,' did, in a high degree, 'guide other states to spiritual liberty.' What becomes, then, of the asserted antagonism, in this point of view, between the destiny of England and that of Germany?

But, even waiving this self-contradiction, the assertion itself militates against fact. It may be true, indeed, that Germany effected much towards the reformation of Christianity; but the statement that Germany was, distinctively (and therefore in exclusion of other nations in anything like an equal degree), the reformer of Christianity, is the most extraordinary misconception of fact that we happen to have ever read. The leading

individual reformers who were German in origin, and who laboured in Germany, were comparatively few. The wars undertaken, and the sufferings endured, in the cause of the Reformation, were as numerous and as extensive in France as in Germany. The Bohemian movement in favour of the Reformation was not German, but Slavonic. The success achieved by the Reformers in this country, was by far greater than that which attended the Germans (even inclusively of Bohemia); for here it was universal and complete. In Germany, on the other hand, it was partial in point of numbers, and even deficient in point of security. In what possible point of view, then, can a nation, traditionally divided between Catholic and Protestant, be distinctively the reformer of Christianity? And while our own Reformation was mainly effected early in the sixteenth century, and was soon afterwards immovably secured, can Sir James Stephen be ignorant of the imperfect nature of the securities offered for the Reformed Religion in Germany, by the Treaties of Passau, of Augsburg, and even of Westphalia?

There is, in truth, one point of religious distinctiveness which may be claimed for Germany. That nation has been essentially the 'prolific mother' of heresies. It is, we fear, only by a very comprehensive latitudinarianism that Germany can be said, at this day, to retain the character which she once possessed (though not distinctively, as Sir James asserts), of a 'reformer of a corrupted Christianity.' For, with the revolution of three centuries of time, it would be well if she would begin another Reformation which should proceed from a different quarter. The services of Germany in protesting against the errors of Rome, have been neutralized by worse errors of an opposite character; and it may be with reason apprehended that few nations, at this hour, are further removed from the purity of Christian truth.

But, *thirdly*, we read it was the idiosyncrasy of Germanic destiny, that Germany should be the 'conservator of the liberties and independence of the European commonwealth.' Judging, as we necessarily must, of these characteristics of Germany by the acts of her governments, who wield her power, it is certain that she has done far more for the subjugation of those 'liberties,' and that 'independence,' than for their maintenance. Thus, up to the period of the Treaty of Constance, an indefinite territorial aggrandisement, and an open defiance of national rights, constituted the policy of the Holy Roman empire. Thus, again, the policy of Charles V. developed a similar character. Thus, too, the policy of the elder and the younger Ferdinand aimed at the subversion of the European system. Sentiments repugnant to such a policy, and acts

stronger than any sentiments, were undoubtedly developed by large sections of the German people, at the two later periods to which we refer. But it is obviously true that the political acts resulting from the existence of Germany have been, at different periods, far more strongly directed to the subjugation than to the independence of Europe.

One word more upon this theory. Sir James Stephen asserts that 'each nation of the earth' has its own distinctive characteristics. But he has absorbed almost all possible national characteristics in the three nations of Germany, France, and England. And not only so; but he has absorbed them, as we have seen, in each of these nations. What distinctive characteristics, then, can he find for Italy, Spain, Sweden, Holland, and twenty other nations whom he authorizes to demand them at his hands? Had not Spain and Venice a high claim to an European influence in 'commercial wealth,'—Switzerland and Sweden in 'spiritual liberty,'—Sweden, again, and Holland, in 'international liberties,'—Italy and Spain in imaginative thought (as one element of the 'civilisation' exclusively assigned to France),—Italy, again, and Holland, in the arts,—and many of these in a more than equal degree with the nations to whom the Lecturer appropriates such qualities?

Let us revert, then, from matters of reasoning to matters of fact; and see whether Sir James Stephen is, on other subjects, more fortunate in the domain of history than in that of logic. We will consider the account which the Lecturer has given of the Anglo-Saxon Constitution.

Whatever may be the character of the erudition displayed by Sir James concerning the history of France, we had expected to find that the final divergence of these lectures to the political character of the Anglo-Saxon age would be marked by less of misconception and of error. But the essay in question contains somewhat less of historical accuracy than Sir E. Bulwer Lytton's poem of 'King Arthur.' Our information on this subject is, in very many points of view, defective, contradictory, or uncertain. It is thus impossible—although, again, there are many positions which we may fully establish—to form a complete scheme of Anglo-Saxon polity. But Sir James is evidently a writer of too fertile an imagination to be daunted by any want of historical facts. He supplies us with every link in the chain of government, with a precision in detail, and a dogmatism in narration, which a disquisition upon the reigns of the Tudors would have barely justified. The rigour with which he subordinates every stubborn fact to the consistency of the theory with which he has set out, is only equal to the ready facility with which he fills each eternal vacuum in

the Saxon annals, or confides, for matters of fact, in the conceptions of his own creative fancy.

First, then, the most prominent and important assertion in this essay involves an anachronism of nearly three hundred years. The author has contrived to confound the political features of two periods of Anglo-Saxon history, remote from each other in character and in time. He speaks of the Heptarchy, or Octarchy, as existing in subordination to a central government under Athelstane in the tenth century:—

‘But in the persons of Athelstane and his successors, the Anglo-Saxon realms were united into one confederation, though not incorporated into one kingdom. Over these confederate states (the Octarchy) reigned a sovereign to whom his people gave the name of Brettwalda—that is, the wielder or ruler of Britain. Thus, Athelstane was Brettwalda of the whole of Albion. The men of Kent and the men of Sussex were alike his subjects; but they were not fellow-citizens. *He was not only the king of eight adjacent and rival states, but was also the mediator between them.*—Vol. ii. p. 476.

The same allusion to the existence of the Octarchy, in this period, is to be found in other passages.

Now, it is clear from this passage, and from the context, that Sir James Stephen imagines the later form of Anglo-Saxon government, which witnessed the aggregation of the chief executive power of England under a single head, as a constructive development of the earlier form, which had exhibited the spectacle of an un-united Octarchy, or of eight kingdoms independent of each other. Scarcely any supposition can be more erroneous. Between these two periods, the Heptarchy, or Octarchy, was destroyed by conquest. Egbert, who was the contemporary and imitator of Charlemagne, annihilated the integrity of this system, and probably was the first to shadow forth the office of Brettwalda, as a distinct principle of government. ‘The men of Kent and Surrey, and the East Saxons ‘and South Saxons, considered him as their deliverer from the ‘unlawful power of the Mercians, and from the strange kings ‘whom the Mercians had imposed on them,’ &c. (Sir F. Palgrave’s *Rise and Progress of Eng. Com.* c. 18.) ‘The success of Egbert, however, was incomplete; and, as Mr. Hallam says, in his Supplemental Notes, ‘the reduction of England under one ‘sovereign was by Edward the Elder, who, therefore, was the ‘founder of our monarchy more justly than Egbert.’ The assertions of these writers are based upon unquestionable authorities, whereas the Lecturér offers no corroboration whatever. So much, then, first, for Sir James Stephen’s theory of a constructive constitutional development; and, secondly, for his assignment of this aggregation of power to the person of Athelstane in the first instance.

But, independently of this intervening revolution, 'Athelstane and his successors' were not 'placed in authority over eight rival states, each with its peculiar king,' as Sir James tells us, for the very sufficient reason that there were, in their day, no such states, and no such kings. The system of the Octarchy had then been long abolished. The Saxon Chronicle tells us indeed, 'that Athelstane ruled the kings in the Island.' But of the four potentates of any kind which it enumerates, there is but one within the limits of the then extinguished Octarchy who is designated as a king; while a second was king of Scotland, a third, king of Wales; and the fourth, styled, not as a king, but as a feudal chief. Sir F. Palgrave, moreover, shows (ccxv.) that the king of Wales maintained his independence; and there is no doubt that the king of Scotland was independent also—a discrepancy which we may explain under the supposition that the Chronicle spoke of 'England' under the term of 'the island.' The one king and the feudal chief would then alone remain to constitute the Lecturer's Octarchy of kings. Sir James, on the other hand, has first taken the aggregate of the English potentates; he has then taken the square of the aggregate; and he has finally taken the double of the square!

If, from the reign of Athelstane, we turn to that of Canute, one of 'his successors,' we find that his government consisted of a *tetrarchy*. One of these four divisions he ruled himself; and the remaining three were governed by Earls whom he appointed to the discharge, like Lords Lieutenants of counties, of the public administration (Sir F. Palgrave, c. 19). What resemblance do we find here either to an Octarchy, in point of numbers, or to 'rival' (p. 476) and 'independent' (p. 484) states in point of political rank? •

Sir James Stephen's misconception of the Anglo-Saxon government appears to extend, we regret to say, to nearly all ranks and orders of the state. He defines the Eorls as the titled nobles, and the Ceorls as 'the commons of the realm.' Here he is conclusively contradicted by Mr. Hallam, who shows that 'eorl' and 'ceorl' corresponded to 'gentle' and 'simple;' and that the rank of 'eorl' did not convey any title whatever, until, in a very late period, Anglo-Saxon institutions had been changed by Danish influence. (Suppl. Notes.) Again, his notion of a 'royal caste' requires essential modification; for that caste was exposed to continual revolution. Thus, too, he characterises (p. 488) the Anglo-Saxon constitution, as 'aiming at an equality of rights, and not at an equality of conditions.' Can any description be more erroneous, when the slaves, who are acknowledged universally to have been destitute of political rights, constituted probably the bulk of the community?

Nothing, moreover, can be more monstrously inaccurate than this writer's view of the constitutional relations of the component states of England, as exhibiting 'much of the character of a congress of independent powers' (p. 484). Indeed, there is good reason to doubt whether constitutional relations were in that day in any degree susceptible of legal definition. We learn from Sir F. Palgrave (c. 19), that the Sub-Reguli held their offices 'by grace of the Brettwalda;' and again, that even under the reign of Egbert, 'Wiglaf of Mercia accepted his kingdom as a benefice from the 'Conqueror.' These, and many other statements, clearly imply nothing more than feudal relations; and feudal relations, too, dependent (Pal. c. 21) more, on strength than on law. '*It is impossible,*' says Mr. Hallam, '*to define the subordination of different kingdoms, where any subordination existed.*' But even conceding the existence of the strictest constitutional relations, the Lecturer's definition of them is, on his own showing, very inaccurate. 'In the Anglo-Saxon king, or Brettwalda,' he tells us, 'resided in theory (if not in fact) all the powers of the state.' And this, because the Wittenagemote was summoned, and its laws were enacted, in his name. But he tells us, again, that the local Wittenagemote of each component state had the power of rejecting, and did frequently reject, the laws of the general Wittenagemote, and this power of rejection was in no way derived from the Brettwalda. There must have existed, therefore, co-ordinate powers with those of the Brettwalda, in direct antagonism to his own, at once 'in theory' and 'in fact.' The powers of the different States, if this description were true, could no more spring from the Brettwalda, than those of the Germanic States, in 1848, from the Administrator at Frankfurt. The Lecturer further illustrates the relation of the central to the local government, on the analogy of the constitution of the United States (p. 476). It would have been difficult to have found a more inappropriate comparison. The component states of the great American commonwealth possess no right of rejecting the law of the Central Congress; and the analogy, therefore, subsides into a direct contrast. Thus, again, if Sir James Stephen had consulted either ancient documents, or Sir Francis Palgrave's writings, on the question of the hereditary descent of the crown, which he considers as essentially analogous to its descent at this hour, he would have seen that a special act of the Legislature was almost invariably deemed essential to the validity of the succession. The crown, therefore, was rather elective than hereditary. Theganus tells us the same of Carolingian France.

We will take one other instance of Sir James Stephen's

process of reasoning. It shall be his theory of the Divine Right of Kings, with which his volumes conclude:—

‘From the days of Alfred and of Athelstane, to these days, our sovereigns have reigned (every lover of our national liberties will acknowledge, *if wise*, that they have reigned) by Divine Right. There is a deep and generous philosophy, as well as a more than human wisdom, in the apostolic canon, “that the powers which be are ordained of God”—the powers symbolized whether by the staff of the constable, or by the crown of the monarch.’—Vol. ii. pp. 491, 492.

* This theory, then, acknowledges a co-ordinate divine right in all possessors of actual power; and, as an inevitable deduction, invests Marat and Robespierre with a corresponding sacred and superhuman authority with Louis XVI. and George III. Who, therefore, can regard the theory of the Divine Right of Kings, as it is enunciated by this author, as conveying any moral force, or as entitling the subjects of such a right to any respect, *as such*?

‘The servile maxims,’ Sir James continues, ‘for which that doctrine has been made the pretext, are not legitimate deductions from it. They proceed upon a total misapprehension of its real meaning. That meaning is, that all human power is indissolubly connected with a *corresponding responsibility* both to God as its author, and to man as the subject of it.’

How does he arrive at this ‘corresponding responsibility to God and man?’ If man has no share in the investiture of authority, how can a king so acknowledge his subordination as to be responsible to him, conjunctively with his responsibility to the Almighty? If there is, as this theory inevitably implies, an exclusively divine right, how can there be a human right also? To say that a king may be responsible to God for his conduct towards man, is an intelligible proposition. Yet it is a proposition no more true of a king than of the meanest slave. But Sir James Stephen’s position, on the other hand, is simply equivalent to asserting that there is an authority, and that there is not an authority.—To this endless concatenation of inconsistencies, then, we are told that, ‘if wise’ (p. 491), we must subscribe. And it is our acquiescence in reasoning such as this, that is to be held up as the condition and the evidence of our speculative sagacity! The disposition of Sir James Stephen to identify philosophical truth with his own opinions, pervades, indeed, the whole of these volumes, which he here aptly concludes with these violently illogical propositions, in illustration of his own distinctive wisdom.

Here, then, we close this subject. We trust that our observations are not characterised by any gratuitous discourtesy. But it will have been seen that there are other considerations

involved in these volumes than either mis-statements of fact, or the strangest incoherences of speculative thought. To say that such a work will never be regarded as authoritative in this or any other country, would, indeed, appear a truism. But we may declare that we have dealt fairly and impartially with every passage which we have criticised; that we have endeavoured to select the subjects of our criticism with equal justice; and that in many other portions of these Lectures we could have pointed to statements not less obnoxious to dispraise. We deem it a duty to the literature in which we hold a place, fairly to discuss the characteristics of this work; and content with its discharge, we leave our justification with confidence in the hands of the public.

But, as concerns the University of Cambridge, the result is essentially different. It is scarcely flattering to our national character, that while the most powerful philosophical and historical treatises are issuing from the Universities of Northern Germany and of France, such a work as this should emanate from a Professor of the Queen in that illustrious Academy. It is not, however, in Cambridge alone, as we have already said, that this writer holds a position of authority in historical education. We deem it only right to submit, then, that this is not a fit 'text-book' at once for England, and for India. And it is by much too bad that such a work should be perpetuated both in evidence of the critical acumen of our own Universities, and as a book of reference for the rising generation.

ART. II.—1. *Judgment pronounced in the Consistory Court of London, by the Right Hon. S. Lushington, LL.D., &c.*

2. *A Letter to the Right Hon. Dr. Lushington, &c.* By HENRY LORD BISHOP OF EXETER. London: Murray. 1856.

3. *Strictures, Legal and Historical, on the Judgment of the Consistory Court, London, in December, 1855, in the Case of Westerton v. Liddell, &c.* By JOHN DAVID CHAMBERS, M.A., Recorder of New Sarum. London: Benning. 1856. •

THAT zeal for the glory of God prompted the proceedings of Mr. Westerton and the party whom he represents against the ornaments at Pimlico, can scarcely be imagined even by those who, on the old Puritanical principles, sincerely object to such things. It is too evident that a desire to oppose others was the moving principle in the whole business; and the promoters of the suit must secretly smile at the position which, in the estimation of some persons, they now occupy as defenders of the faith. We, however, doubt whether Mr. Westerton and his friends are really members of the Church of England, since it is no uncommon thing for Dissenters to get themselves chosen as churchwardens for the sake of opposing the clergy. When the mob take up a matter about which they can know nothing, the originators of the movement cannot expect that their conduct should not lead to a scrutiny of their motives.

Reviewing the whole case, even without reference to the propriety or legality of the matters in dispute, we can come to no other conclusion than that a desire to annoy others, and to obtain notoriety for themselves, as well as to secure a victory over a clergyman, whose acts of kindness will be remembered in the district when his opponents and their crusade are forgotten, encouraged the movers to act in this not very creditable affair. To accomplish their purpose, indeed, pretensions of no ordinary zeal for the Church are obtruded upon the public, though we are by no means certain that the promoters of the suit are not as much opposed to the Church herself as to the clergy at Pimlico. It is certain that some 'whose names are on the back of the Bill' are not members of the Church. That Westerton is a mere *charlatan*, and simply desirous to force himself into notoriety, is clear from his proceedings at a political meeting held in the spring at S. Martin's Hall.

But our business is with the Judgment in the Consistorial Court, and with the arguments on which it was grounded. According to the decision of the Court, it is simply unlawful to place a cross of any kind near the Altar, or in the Chancel,

even as an ornament. We say, as an ornament, for the Court has decided that it is not to be regarded as an image. This decision simplifies the matter; for by declaring the cross to be only an ornament, the arguments in the Homilies respecting images cannot be brought to bear upon the case, nor can the promoters of the suit appeal to the Homilies in the inquiry. Dr. Lushington's decision, therefore, reduces the matter to this simple question, Is the cross an ornament forbidden by law, or is its rejection or adoption within the discretion of the ordinary? Our business will be to establish the latter position. The Court admitted that there was no express prohibition; but it adopted the extraordinary position, that everything not expressly enjoined is forbidden—a position which must, if allowed, overturn many of our present practices, and bring us into a state of utter confusion. Our present inquiry relates not to the propriety or impropriety of crosses in churches—how a Christian can upon principle object to the symbol of salvation is past our comprehension—but to the strange assertion of Dr. Lushington, that crosses were removed from all churches before the end of Elizabeth's reign, and that such as were afterwards found in them had been replaced under the influence of Archbishop Laud.

It may, however, be well, before we enter upon the historical inquiry, to glance at the arguments in the Homilies respecting images, in order to ascertain whether the Reformers gave evidence of any hostility to the figure of the cross in churches; for, notwithstanding the decision of the Court, there are persons who view it as a superstitious image.

Undoubtedly, the Homilies condemn the general use of images in churches, or rather the adoration of them. Following Holy Scripture, and adhering to primitive practice, the Church of England condemns as unlawful the use of images for superstitious purposes. Against such use the Homilies are expressly directed. It is, however, evident that the Reformers, in speaking strongly against images, referred only to such as had been, or such as might be, abused. That the abuse only was intended is evident from the fact that vast numbers of images or pictures (and the terms are used indiscriminately) remained until the period of the Long Parliament; while many exist in our churches at the present time. It is expressly stated in the Homily, that at that time the churches were *clean scoured* of images; consequently, such only as had been abused could have been intended.¹

¹ The passage in 'The Homily concerning the Time and Place of Prayer,' respecting singing and organs, explains the meaning of the framers with respect to other things which had not been abused. If the argument be that organs are forbidden by the Homilies, the reply is, that they were not removed from churches; consequently, such could not have been the intention. Organs and pictures were permitted to remain; but all idolatrous practices were abolished. The Homilies,

The Reformers comprehended under the general term images, not only statues of wood and stone, but all figures painted on glass, or other material. Such as had been abused were designated *monuments of superstition and idolatry*; but in this designation they did not comprehend statues and figures on glass to which no adoration had been paid. Moreover, it is worthy of observation, that the cross is not mentioned in the Homilies in connexion with images; consequently, whatever may be said against the latter, it is clear that the former was not in the minds of the framers of the Homilies. This is a point of great importance in our inquiry, since some persons, whose zeal exceeds their knowledge, are disposed to include in the censure of the Homilies everything which their own disturbed imaginations may regard as superstitious, just as many others consider all practices as Popish which they themselves dislike.

Images of God the Father were entirely prohibited, while such other figures as had been abused were removed. Beyond this limit the prohibition did not extend; for many images or pictures of Saints remained in the churches, and still remain in various places. The cross also remained; and notwithstanding Dr. Lushington's decision, we contend that, in the absence of any express law, the custom long-continued settles the question.¹

The injunctions of Queen Elizabeth must be interpreted by the same rule. When they ordered the removal of all monuments of superstition, such only as had been abused were intended. We may fairly infer that such representations as were permitted to remain, were not contemplated by the royal injunctions. Sometimes the injunctions are alleged to prove that paintings in windows are prohibited by the Church. 'Shrines, coverings of shrines, candlesticks, pictures, paintings, and all other monuments of feigned miracles, idolatry, and superstition, are specified. All such things were to be destroyed, so that there remain no memory of the same on walls, glass-windows, or elsewhere.' The royal Visitation Articles were framed in accordance with the injunctions; and as many images and pictures were destroyed, we may reasonably conclude that such as were permitted to remain were not intended by the

therefore, are as much against organs as pictures; and, as the former were never removed, we argue that it was not the intention to destroy any of the latter, except such as had been abused. The Homilies assert, that organs and images had been removed; yet we know that both remained; the inference is, that the abuse of the latter had been abolished. At all events, if the Homilies are pleaded against crosses, which they do not mention, they must be pleaded against organs, which they do mention. By the Puritans they were pleaded against both.

¹ A writer who was strongly opposed to all innovations, admits that images were lawful in churches, though he considered them dangerous. 'I come to the second thing, that images may be placed in temples, a thing I confess lawful, but dangerous.'—Yates's *Ibis ad Cæsarem*, 1626, p. 18.

Queen's advisers. Moreover, the cross, which is not even mentioned, could not have been included. We shall presently see that vast numbers of paintings and crosses existed in 1640, which had remained since the Reformation. Besides, it can scarcely be supposed, as the Lutherans retained not only the cross, but also the crucifix as well as images, that our Reformers, who had such respect for the Confession of Augsburg, intended to remove anything which had not been abused in the preceding times.¹

We now proceed to consider Dr. Lushington's strange assertion respecting crosses. The judgment is, that the cross is unlawful because it is not prescribed. The consequences involved in this singular opinion will appear as we proceed in our inquiry. He then states, that all crosses were removed from churches before the end of the reign of Elizabeth, and that they were revived in many places by the influence of Archbishop Laud. He first asserts, that all crosses were gradually removed from churches under Elizabeth; and then he assumes, that such as existed in 1640 had been introduced by Laud. We mean to show that crosses existed in churches from the period of the Reformation. Dr. Lushington's assertion is contrary to facts, as we shall demonstrate; and thus the judgment, founded upon his own assumptions, falls to the ground.²

¹ 'It took a middle course—first to condemn all manner of adoration or worship of them; but whereas some use might be made of them for remembrance of histories past, to retain in sundry parts such windows and pictures, as might, without offence, instruct the ignorant, which, if any man since hath been offended at, it must be on other grounds than I understand.'—Twisden's *Vindication of the Church of England*, p. 187. That the first Reformers intended no general destruction of crosses, or even images, beyond such as were abused to superstitious purposes, is obvious from the Act of the 1st year of Elizabeth, restraining persons from interfering on their own authority. It serves also to interpret the Homilies and injunctions. Thus it enacts, that no person should destroy 'of their own power and authority any altar, or any crucifix, or cross, that now or hereafter shall be in any church, chapel, or churchyard.'—*Collection of Statutes from Magna Charta to the thirty-fifth year of Elizabeth*, p. 407. Altars were removed by authority, but crosses never were; consequently, by this Act they may be said to be allowed where they existed; and even a power is implied, at least, of setting them up in future. The Act of Uniformity of Queen Elizabeth, as well as the Rubric, establishes the ornaments in use in Edward's second year. Her Act is confirmed by that of 1662. And though no ornaments of churches are specified in the Act of Edward, yet we may rest assured that a meaning was attached to Elizabeth's, and that ornaments were used in Edward's second year. These, therefore, are confirmed by Elizabeth. Now, we know that candlesticks were used, and sometimes crosses, in his second year; consequently, they are now allowed under the direction of the ordinary.

² The Queen's Proclamation, restraining the excesses in pulling down images, confirms the view here taken. In short, the whole of the documents to which we have referred, admit of no other construction than that which we have put upon them. Thus the Proclamation alluding to the orders for removing images distinctly states, that authority was only given 'to deface monuments of idolatry and false faded images in the churches and abbeys.' It then orders, that no one should 'break any image in glass windows in any churches, without consent of the ordinary;' evidently meaning, that the ordinary would ascertain whether anything

It may be necessary to remark in the outset, that no distinction is made between a cross painted on glass, and a cross of wood or metal in a screen, or a cross wrought upon a cloth. Dr. Lushington makes no distinction between such crosses; but he decides that all are unlawful. Now, without asserting the general use of crosses, it is sufficient for our purpose to prove that they existed in many churches, and that there was no prohibition against them; for it will thus be obvious that they were altogether within the discretion of the ordinary. Our position is, that the cross in churches is a matter of indifference in the eye of the law, neither enjoined nor prohibited, and therefore within the jurisdiction of the bishop. We find, accordingly, that crosses ever existed. We do not mean to assert that the same feeling existed at all times. At one time the bishops and clergy may have been more zealous in the matter than at another. During one generation, crosses on tapestry on the east wall, or on the frontal, may have been permitted to fade; in the next, they may have been restored or replaced by new ones. So in one generation crosses on screens may have been allowed to go somewhat to decay; in the next, they may have been repaired and re-gilded. Their condition depended on the feelings of the bishops and clergy, who may have evinced more zeal at one time than at another; while by some bishops a stronger desire to preserve them was manifested than by others.¹

The matter is a very simple one. The thing itself is indifferent in the eye of the law; and the question rests with the ordinary. In the absence of any law, we can only be guided by custom; and from the Reformation, it has been the practice to have crosses in many churches; consequently, it is lawful to have them in any. If, as is now argued by some persons, the bare sight of a cross may cause men to rush into Popery, how was it that our an-

had been abused.—Wilkins, iv. 221. Fuller observes of this Proclamation, 'Her princely care took this desired effect, that it stopped the main stream of sacrilege therein, though some by-rivulets thereof ran still in private churches, in defiance of all orders provided to the contrary.'—Church History, lib. ix. 67.

¹ The case in the diocese of Lincoln, under Bishop Barlow, does not bear on our present inquiry; yet we notice it here, lest it should be urged, either that we were ignorant of it, or intentionally avoided any allusion to the matter. We repeat, that it bears not upon our inquiry, because it relates only to images, while we are concerned only with crosses and ornaments. In Barlow's case, the churchwardens, without any authority, set up images or pictures of the Apostles. The bishop ordered their removal, when the churchwardens commenced proceedings in the Court of Arches against his lordship. The case was, however, stopped. The churchwardens had acted contrary to law, since they had proceeded without the consent of the ordinary, 'or the general consent of the parish.' Barlow wrote out his case, and it was afterwards published. It relates only to images, not to the cross or ornaments.—Barlow's Cases of Conscience, No. 1692. The 'Breviate the case of Setting up of Images,' was published in a separate form during the discussions connected with Welton and the altar-piece at Whitochapel.

cestors escaped, who certainly were not alarmed at such things? Indeed, if the mere view of the simple emblem of our profession is sufficient to send a man to Rome, he is not likely to be retained by its removal. But such absurd notions are propagated only to answer an end, and for party purposes; for no one can believe that the figure of the cross can foster image-worship or superstition, though it may serve the purpose of certain persons to say so.¹

It is admitted by Dr. Lushington that Queen Elizabeth retained in her own chapel, not the cross, but a crucifix. At that period there were divisions of opinion on such matters, as there are in the present day, yet no one argued that even the crucifix was absolutely unlawful. The fact relative to the crucifix, is recorded in all our histories. Some contemporary writers speak of it with sorrow, yet the illegality is not even hinted. In 1559, Jewell, writing to Peter Martyr, says, 'That little silver cross, of ill-omened origin, still maintains its place in the Queen's chapel. This thing will soon be drawn into a precedent. There was at one time some hope of its being removed; and we all of us diligently exorted ourselves, and still continue to do, that it might be so. But, as far as I can perceive, it is now a hopeless case.' A year later, Sampson, writing to Martyr, says, 'What can I hope for while the crucifix is allowed with lights burning before it? The altars, indeed, are removed, and images also throughout the kingdom; the crucifix and candles are retained at court alone.' Yet Sampson saw no more Popery in the crucifix than in the bishop's robes, which he calls in the same letter, 'the golden vestments of the Papacy.' In 1560, Parkhurst writes to Bullinger, 'I wrote you word that the cross, wax candles and candlesticks had been removed from the Queen's chapel; but they were shortly after brought back again, to the great grief of the godly. The candles heretofore were lighted every day, but now not at all.'²

The Reformers differed among themselves, just as men will differ, respecting such things as crosses and crucifixes. In the Zurich letters we find evidences of their differences. 'We are only constrained,' says Cox, Bishop of Ely, 'to our great distress of mind, to tolerate in our churches the image of the cross and

¹ We do not enter upon the question of stone altars; though we do not doubt that the Committee of Privy Council will take the common-sense view, namely, that the material is of no importance. Dr. Lushington did not feel himself at liberty to enter at large upon the question, because the Consistorial Court is bound by the decision of the Court of Arches in the Cambridge case. He ventured, however, to express his concurrence in that decision. What that decision was is often forgotten. Sir H. Fust did not prohibit stone altars; still less did he authorize their removal. He only declined to issue a faculty to permit the erection of one.

² Zurich Letters, l. pp. 55, 63, 129.

'Him who was crucified.' And Jewell, in 1560, says to Peter Martyr, 'This controversy about the crucifix is now at its height. You would scarcely believe to what a degree of insanity some persons have been carried upon so foolish a subject. A disputation upon this subject will take place to-morrow. The Moderators will be persons selected by the Council. The disputants on the one side, are the Archbishop of Canterbury and Cox; and on the other, Grindal and myself. As far as I can conjecture, I shall not write to you again as a bishop; for matters are come to that pass, that either the crosses of silver and tin, which we have everywhere broken in pieces, must be restored, or our bishoprics relinquished.' In the same year Cox says to George Cassander, 'There is no open quarrel, but yet there does not exist an entire agreement among us with respect to setting up the crucifix in churches. Some think it allowable, provided only that no worship or veneration be paid to the image itself; others are of opinion that all images are so universally forbidden, that it is altogether sinful for any to remain in churches. But we are in that state, that no crucifix is to be seen in any of our churches.'¹

Cox, it appears, wrote to Cassander for his opinion on the subject. The latter was uncertain whether the inquiry related to the figure of the cross, or to the image upon it. 'I understand that you are not altogether agreed among yourselves with respect to the setting up the image of the cross or the crucifix in the church; but I do not sufficiently understand whether the question refers to the mere figure of a cross, or also to the image of Christ hanging upon it. I have seen a certain print which contained a cross only, with some texts of Holy Scripture in the English language on each side, whence I suspect that your question only refers to the figure of the cross. You are aware in what frequent use, and in what great esteem, the figure of the cross was held among the early Christians, and this too before the practice of setting up other images in the churches. They made a great distinction between the figure of the cross and all other images. This observance I am unwilling should be regarded as superstitious, though I would have the superstition of the people to be repressed and guarded against, and this seems to have been your object in that representation which I saw here.' It is evident that Cox had sent the print to Cassander for his opinion. The latter suggests a different class of texts, such 'as explain the mystery and hidden signification of it.'² Cox must have proposed the use of the cross in some way or other, or Cassander could not have replied in such

¹ Zurich Letters, i. pp. 66, 67; ii. 41, 42. .

. ² Ib. ii. pp. 43, 45.

a strain. It is clear that the simple cross was not disliked by the great body of the Reformers; and the very difference of opinion proves the existence of the thing, and that there was no express law against its use. Dr. Lushington argues that it is unlawful, because not expressly enjoined; yet the Reformers, who are the best interpreters of their own intentions, evidently regarded the use of the cross in a very different light.

Sampson was a violent Puritan, and wrote to Peter Martyr, who says: 'To come to your last question: to have the image of the crucifix upon the Holy Table at the administration of the Lord's Supper I do not count among things indifferent.' Sampson had asked Martyr to write to the Queen. He declines, on the ground of various occupations; suggesting, however, that his letters would be of no avail, since the English were reported to be about to adopt the Confession of Augsburg. 'If, as is reported, it be the determination of your countrymen to embrace the Confession of Augsburg, and court an alliance with the Protestants, you may judge for yourself in what esteem my letters will be held.' The evidence from these letters is very important. The letters show that differences existed on this subject: yet these very differences prove the existence of the cross in churches at that period. The allusion to the Augsburg Confession is also important, as showing the general impression among the foreign Reformers of the views of the Anglican bishops: for though there was no intention of adopting that Confession, yet it is certain that our Reformers did not intend to denounce the practices which it enjoined, and which the Lutherans still retain. In the Lutheran churches the cross and the crucifix still remain. This argument will also apply to the case of Archdeacon Denison: for we may rest assured that our Reformers never intended to condemn either doctrines or practices retained in the Confession of Augsburg.¹ We are

¹ Zurich Letters, ii. pp. 47, 48.

² In the proceedings which took place after the Restoration, under the Royal Commission, respecting the Liturgy, the bishops, in reply to the objections of the Presbyterians, remark, 'It was never found fault with by those to whom the name of Protestant most properly belongs—those that profess the Augustine Confession.' This was a hard blow at the Presbyterians, who boasted of the name Protestant, yet their brethren on the Continent had not adopted it. The term was applied to the Lutherans, while the term 'Reformed' was assumed by the Presbyterians. Not a few in our own country are still ignorant of the origin and meaning of the name Protestant. We cannot resist the temptation to give an extract from an author, who never adopted extreme views, on this word Protestant. Alluding to the opponents of the Church in his day, 1719, he says, 'The word Protestant serves for all ends with them; but who knows what it means more than a protester against the Pope? A man may deny the divinity of Christ, and yet be a true Protestant. And what do they mean by the true Protestant religion? They cannot understand the

now, however, concerned only with the fact, whether the cross, as Dr. Lushington asserts, is unlawful in our churches. As the early Christians held the figure of the cross in such reverence, it would be rash to assert that its use is proscribed by the Church of England, who professed, in her Reformation, to go back to the usages of the primitive times.

The crucifix remained many years in the Queen's Chapel. It was broken in 1571 by the Queen's fool, at the instigation of Sir Francis Knolles. The fact that it was not restored merely shows that the thing was regarded as indifferent, not as unlawful.¹

The sign of the cross in baptism is enjoined by an express Rubric, and explained in the Canon; and no one can honestly minister in the Church of England who objects to its use. It is fair to infer that the Reformers who enjoined the sign could have no objection to the simple figure of the cross: and this view was adopted by the Puritans, many of whom denounced the sign as worse than the material cross. Volumes even were written on this subject, and much labour was employed to prove that the sign was more dangerous than the figure. It was said that the sign was used in a sacrament, in which the minister was an actor and approver; while the figure was merely seen with the eye, and involved no approval on the part of the spectator. If the cross be really obnoxious to blame, this argument was certainly a legitimate one, and one which could not easily be refuted. When the Puritans argued that the sign was made by

religion of Luther, for there are few such in the kingdom; nor of Calvin, for then an infinite number of sects must be excluded; if they design all dissenters from the Church of Rome, they include all religions but that, and make Protestant pagans as well as Protestant Christians. So that our true Protestants are a body of men composed of all religions, provided they do but agree in a common opposition to the Church of Rome. As the word has obtained in the Church of England to signify a member of the Reformation, I confess myself to be a Protestant. Such true Protestants as the canonical sons of the Church I am exceedingly pleased with, both as to name and thing; but as to that adulterate issue who take upon themselves the name of their mother, and yet disclaim her authority and doctrine, they are no other, in my opinion, than so many handitti or debauched branches of a noble family. Yet these men not only value themselves upon their zeal for the king and the Protestant religion, but deliver over to the devil, for plotters and papists, all the true sons of the Church that refuse to join with them.—Lewis on the Consecration of Churches, Preface, pp. vi, viii, ix. Is not this description applicable to some of our own Church, who, because certain of our members are gone to Rome, bring the charge of popery against all who manifest a desire to carry out the obvious intentions of the Church? With these men a Protestant is one who opposes many of the rules and ceremonies of the Church of England.

¹ Heylin's *Presbyterians*, p. 486; *Ecclesia Restaurata*, p. 124. It was broken 'by Pach the fool (no wiser man daring to undertake such a desperate service), at the instigation of Sir Francis Knolles.'—Heylin's *Life of Laud*, p. 15. Parker on *The Cross*, pp. 7, 66; *Fulke's Defence*, &c., pp. 81, 85. Parker says, 'Martial justifieth the popish crosse by the crosse which standeth in the Queen's Chapel,' p. 135. *Strype's Annals*, part i. pp. 259, 262; part ii. pp. 500, 502.

the minister, while the figure was merely seen by the eye, they adopted an argument which no one who denounces the use of the cross in our churches can consistently meet. 'Like our reforming zealots, the Puritans disliked the cross in every form, but they denounced the sign with more earnestness than the figure.'

Dr. Lushington affirms that all crosses were removed from churches before the end of the reign of Elizabeth. Hence he argues, that the Reformers were against their use. On this supposition he grounds his decision that they are unlawful. If, then, this position can be overturned by direct and positive evidence, the judgment itself must fall to the ground. If we can prove the existence of crosses in churches from the Reformation to the accession of Charles I., then Dr. Lushington's second assertion, that their use was revived by Archbishop Laud, is disproved.

Since there is no precept, one way or another, the Church having left the matter to the discretion of her bishops, our business will be to ascertain the practice: and to attain our object, we purpose to examine a series of publications from the early part of the reign of Elizabeth down to the period of the Long Parliament. The attacks of the Puritans from time to time will show clearly what was the practice, or what was allowed. If crosses existed, not by express law, but by custom, to 1640, their use was not unlawful. And if the use was not unlawful in 1640, they are not unlawful now. The complaints of the Puritans certainly prove the existence of the things against which their complaints were directed. Of the cross in churches we have numerous complaints from an early period of Elizabeth's reign to 1640.¹

¹ 'The aerial cross is worse than another image.' 'Is it not common to sew red crosses under the shrewdes of the dead overright the heart? To lay white crosses upon the beare?' Parker also speaks of the dove over the font, which, according to Dr. Lushington, must be as unlawful as the cross. 'Doe we not crie out upon the dove let downe of old upon the baptized [one of which I saw at Wickham not abolished some 25 years past].' 'The cross aerial is an image and an idoll as well as the materiall: and in some respects far worse.'—Parker on *The Cross*, folio, 1607, pp. 65–81, 83, 101. Part ii. pp. 138.

² 'Ornaments are recognised by law, though particular things are not specified. It would seem, therefore, that they are to be regulated by the Ordinary. Superstitious pictures cannot be removed without a licence from the Ordinary: and if he is to decide what is superstitious, surely he may decide what is not: and, therefore, a cross would be within his jurisdiction. Ornaments are recognised in various instances, but not specified.—Godolphin's *Ecclesiastical Laws*, pp. 188, 149, 150. 'If a man, who is not any inhabitant within the parish, but hath land there, be rated for the ornaments of the church according to the land, a prohibition lies, for the inhabitants ought to be rated for that.'—*ib.* p. 152. Such a person is chargeable for 'the reparation of the parish church, but not to the buying of the ornaments of that church, for that should be levied of the goods of the parishioners, and not of their lands.' 'In the case of churchwardens the Chief Justice said,

It is admitted that copes are enjoined by law, and some of them exhibited the figure of the cross, which was seen by the people in the celebration of the Lord's Supper. In 1570 the Puritans ask: 'Doe not the people every where thinke a more grievous fault is committed, if the minister doe celebrate the Lord's Supper, or Baptisme, without a surplesse, or a cope, than if the same through his silence should suffer an hundred souls to perishe?' In the same document they assert that strict laws are made for 'mayntayning abominable images.' In 'A View of Antichrist,' put forth at the same period, among the Popish things said to be retained in the Church, are mentioned, 'Images of the Trinity, and many other monuments of superstition generally in all church windows: the cope in great churches: the organs playing away half of the Psalms: the grey amise with catted tails: silken hoodes upon a surplesse: crossing the corps with linnen cloathes.' In 1573, Dering says, 'Our bishops, our deans, our archdeacons, and some other readier to come into the pulpit than well able to preach, were always crying out against copes, tippets, chaunting, organs, belles, crosses, &c., till they brought the people to this passe you see them, and then ran back againe themselves from their first doctrine.'" Dering seems to allude to some who had

that for the repairing the fabrick of the church the charge is real, and charges the land and not the person: but for the ornaments of the church it is personal: and if a man be not an inhabitant he is not chargeable in respect of his land, for such tax doth charge the goods only.—Pp. 137, 154. 'A man is chargeable for reparation of a church by reason of his land; and for the ornaments in the church by reason of his coming to church.' This was held by Yelverton, while other judges held that the person was chargeable for both, whether he came to church or not.—Ib. p. 157. It is held that a person may have 'his carpet, livery, and cushion' in his seat; why, then, may not the minister introduce ornaments in the chancel with the bishop's consent?—Ib. p. 155. Prideaux published his 'Directions to Churchwardens' in 1701. It was printed at Norwich, and is a book of great rarity. We quote a few passages from this edition, to show that at that time some ornaments were recognised; whereas, according to Dr. Lushington's notion, nothing is allowable which is not enjoined. After an enumeration of certain things to be kept in repair by the churchwardens, he says: 'To which, for greater ornament or decency, are added in many churches, paintings, altar-pieces, rails at the altar,' &c. Among the moveable goods of the church he mentions such 'as either the law or else the nature of the things themselves make necessary.' Of these he makes a division, the second comprising such things as are added 'only for the better and more decent administration of the Divine offices.' And among these are, 'a decent pulpit-cloth, a pulpit-cushion, a cloth for the reading-desk, organs, silver basons, branches for lights, candlesticks,' &c.—Prideaux's Directions, 4to., Norwich, 1701. These things are not enjoined by law, they rest with the Ordinary. Now, if the Ordinary can authorize rails at the Communion-table, he may sanction the use of a cross. The Communion-rails and other ornaments, which are not enjoined by law, fall within the discretion of the Ordinary. We argue, therefore, that where the consent of the Ordinary has been obtained the things cannot be removed.

¹ Parte of a Register, p. 45.

² Parte of a Register, pp. 62, 63, 84, 85. In the Act of the 13th of Elizabeth there is this singular clause:—"If any person bring in any token or tokens, thing or

changed their opinions in favour of the ceremonies. Of the particulars we know nothing, but the passage proves the existence of crosses in churches in his day. These passages show that crosses were not disallowed in the earlier portion of the reign of Elizabeth.

Then comes the question—Were they subsequently removed? Dr. Lushington replies in the affirmative: we shall prove the contrary. The same complaint continued throughout the reign, and was unusually loud during the first few years of James I. If crosses were common in churches at the commencement of the reign of James I., they must have existed during that of Queen Elizabeth, and Dr. Lushington's assertion respecting Laud is disproved.

Some years later, in Elizabeth's reign, we meet, in one of the Mar-Prelate tracts, with the following description of a Puritan, which proves that crosses were then common in churches:—

'Whose haire and ruffles dare not his eares exceed:
That on high saints' dayes wears his working weed.
That crosses each doth hate, save on his pence,
And loaths the public robe of penitence.
That in his censure each alike gainsayes,
Poets in pulpits, Holy Writ in playes.
Roods in the windows, and the marriage ring,
The churching vaile, and midwives' christening.
That loves alike an organ in a quire
As th' elephant delights a swine to heare.'

At the close of the reign of Elizabeth, in a work which was not published until James's accession, but which embodied the views of all the more rigid Puritans, they charge the Bishop

things, called or named by the name Agnus Dei, or any crosses, pictures, beads, &c., from the bishop or See of Rome,' he should incur the penalties of a Præmunire. Such things, as the Act states, were hallowed or blessed at Rome; and so were superstitious. The images removed from the churches were of the same character. They had been abused. It is evident that the cross in churches was not so regarded.—Gibson, p. 535. 'A Collection of Statutes, from Magna Charta to the 35th year of Elizabeth,' folio, 1594, p. 96. Our present Church Reformers should bear in mind that their predecessors included many other things in their catalogue of popish enormities. Bishop Cooper tells us that in his day pulpits were comprehended: 'These will have no fonts, but christen children in basins: they will weare no caps nor surplices: many of them will not use the olde pulpits, but have newe made. I marvaile, that they use the churches themselves, than which nothing hath bin more prophaned with superstition and idolatrie.'—Cooper's Admonition, p. 97.

'A Dialogue, wherein is plainly laid open the Tyrannical Dealing of Lord Bishops, &c. by Dr. Martin Mar-Prelate. Harding charged the men of his day with disliking the cross. Jewell replies: 'Whereas Mr. Harding saith the professors of this new Gospel cannot abide the signe of our Lord's crosse; let him understand it is not the crosse of Christ, nor the signe thereof, that we find fault withall, but the superstitious abuse of the crosse.' Jewell, moreover, distinguishes between the cross and an image, as well as between the cross and a crucifix.—Jewell's Works. Reply to Harding, 372.

of London with being only fit for 'wearing of a white rochet, 'walking with a pastoral staffe, hallowing of fontes, whyting of 'walles, painting of tombes, preserving of superstitious monuments in glasse windows, repaying and gylding rotten and 'worn out crosses.' This work was drawn up by the Puritans as a reply to 'Cooper's Admonition to the People of England,' and describes the practice of that day, or the state of things in 1590. Here, then, the Bishop of London is charged with re-gilding a cross, and doubtless the charge is intended to apply to other bishops. The cross must long have existed, or the re-gilding would not have been necessary. Another allusion in this work illustrates the meaning usually attached to the Royal Injunctions respecting superstitious monuments. 'It is doubted 'whether it were a good manner of ecclesiastical discipline for 'the High Commissioners to command the magistrates of the 'town of Banbury, at the suit of certain companions, to reset 'up a crosse which, by virtue of the Queene's Injunctions, they 'had peaceably and lawfully pulled downe.'

Similar complaints were constantly made by the Puritans, and as constantly answered by some of the clergy. We have a very remarkable document privately put forth by the Puritans at the commencement of the reign of James I., which, of course, describes the customs and the practices of the preceding reign. This document gives the views of the whole body. It specifies their grievances, and among them the cross is especially mentioned. We give a few extracts:—

¹ An Assertion for True and Christian Church Policie, 1604, p. 430.

² *Ib.* pp. 347, 348. The cross at Banbury was not in the church; but the circumstance shows how the Injunctions were interpreted by those in authority. They were only levelled against such things as had been abused. In a subsequent page we shall prove the growth of popery in consequence of the sects and divisions under the Long Parliament; and we may here adduce the testimony of one of Elizabeth's prelates, a man of great moderation, to the fact that the converts to popery in her reign were influenced in their change by the strange opinions which prevailed among the Puritans, not by the adherence of churchmen to the rites and ceremonies of the Church. 'The doctrine of the Lord's Supper hath been so slenderly taught by some, that a number have conceived with themselves that they receive nothing but the external elements in remembrance that Christ died for them. And these their cogitations have they uttered to others, to their great misliking. Private baptism, yea, and publike also, if it be ministered by one that is no preacher, hath been so impugned, as if it were no sacrament at all. These, and a number of such others, have bred great offence, and wounded the hearts of an infinite number, causing them partly to revolt to papistic, partly to atheism. As I have talked with many recusants, so did I never conferre with any that woulde use any speech, but that he hath alleged some of these offences to be the cause of his revolting. If God moove not the heartes of the Church-rulers to seeke some ende of this schisme and faction, it cannot be but in short time for one recusant that now is, we shall have three.'—Cooper's Admonition, pp. 121, 122. Loose opinions, not adherence to the rules of the Church, were ever the cause of secessions to Rome. Cooper's prediction was fulfilled. Numbers went to Rome under the rule of the sectaries. Let our present Reformers take warning. They are the men to send others to Rome.

'If that great idoll of the Popish masse, with all the copes, vestements, surplices, crosses, kneelings, candles, &c., be 'abominable and accursed.' They speak here only of such things as were used in the Lord's Supper: consequently the crosses must have been on the wall behind the altar, in the east window above it, or wrought on the copes, or upon the cloth for the table. Thus they say: 'As well the 'magistrates and ministers and people may be snared, and shall 'be accursed with, and for the command and use of copes, 'crosses, &c. Therefore copes, crosses, &c., may not be commanded,' &c. 'If your Lordships answer, that copes, surplices, crosses, be things indifferent,' &c. 'We pray your 'Lordships to resolve us by Holy Writ, that God hath by his 'worde as well purified copes, surplices, crosses, as He hath 'purified meats,' &c. 'That copes, surplices, crosses, candles, ' &c., authorised by that man of sin for the service of his great 'idoll the masse, be of the nature of meats, we deny.' 'The 'Popish masse is an idol, and all the copes, surplices, crosses, 'candles, &c., have been and yet be ornaments to that idol. 'Therefore all crosses, surplices, candles, are to be cast 'away.' 'No copes, surplices, crosses, &c., ought to be a badge 'to the Spouse of Christ.' 'Whether this outward pompe consist not partly in copes, surplices, crosses, &c.? And whether 'these copes, surplices, crosses, &c., be not designed by that 'whore to be the proper tokens of her lovers committing fornication with her great idoll, the breadden god?' 'If your Lordships say, that the maid of England, being instructed that no 'cope, surplice, or crosse, is unclean in itself, may command her 'damsels to fashion their liveries and badges like to those which 'the minions and lovers of the great whore, we then,' &c. 'We 'pray your Lordships to resolve as to whether among our 'priests, whosoever shall come to pray, to preach, or to administer the Sacraments, with a cope, with a surplice, with 'a taper, with a crosse, &c.'¹

The work from which these extracts are given is very curious. It is but little known, since the questions which it discusses have not of late excited much attention: but it is most important in this inquiry, for it proves the general use of crosses at the

¹ 'Certaine Demandes with their Groundes drawne out of Holy Writ, and Propounded in *foro Censientiae*, by some Religious Gentlemen, unto the Reverend Fathers, Richard Archbishop of Canterbury, Richard Bishop of London, William Bishop of Lincolne, Garvasse Bishop of Worcester, William Bishop of Exeter, and Thomas Bishop of Peterborough, whereunto the said Gentlemen require that it would please their Lordships to make a true, plaine, direct, honest, and resolute Answer.' 1605, pp. 19-22, 24, 27-29. The work is privately printed. It proves most incontestably that the cross, in some form or other, was usually seen, at all events, in cathedral and large churches, in the administration of the Holy Communion.

time. Had Dr. Lushington ever seen it, he never could have hazarded his rash assertion that all crosses were removed before the end of Elizabeth's reign. Though the Puritans remained comparatively quiet during the latter part of the reign of Elizabeth, their pause must be attributed to the hopelessness of their case under her Majesty. From James they expected much, and therefore their grievances were anew put forth after his accession. Here, then, we have positive evidence that crosses were common in the year 1605: that they were used in the chancels: and that they were especially seen in the administration of the Lord's Supper; for this circumstance constituted one of their greatest grievances. In some cases, crosses were embroidered on the copes: in others, painted or sculptured on the walls behind the altar: in others, wrought on the cover of the altar. At all events, the figure of the cross existed in many churches. There was no prohibitory law, though it was not enjoined: and in cases in which there is no law the bishop becomes a law, provided he prescribes nothing contrary to any express canon, law, or injunction. Custom not contrary to law or reason has always obtained the force of a law. An Act of Parliament prescribing some things does not prohibit laudable customs not contrary to the rites and orders of the Church. At all events, if a custom is not to be observed, because it is not expressly enjoined, how will those men stand affected who violate positive rubrics which are a part of the law of the land?

In 1607, a Puritan writer complains that the magistrates have ceased to execute lawe against the crosses of church windows for the crosse's sake in baptisme. The preachers' lips in a manner are sewed up from speaking against the very abuse and superstition of the crosse, lest they should seem to speake against the crosse in baptisme.¹ The argument is perfectly just, for it would have been most absurd to have removed the figure from churches, while the sign was retained in one of the Sacraments. The Puritans were consistent in opposing both: it would have been unreasonable to have opposed one only.

In replying to Kellison in 1624, Montagu says: 'No Protestant ever said that it was unlawful to make or have images. That which Protestants mislike and condemne in Papists is

¹ Parker on The Crosse, p. 132. 'Sanders,' says he, 'justifieth popish images by the crosses, which we use.' 'Papists are scandalized with our kneeling before images in glasse windows, with the lifting up of our hands at Paul's crosse.'—P. 135. Part ii. p. 62. The Puritans wrote more against the sign of the cross in baptism than against the figure in churches, because the former was expressly enjoined, while the latter merely existed by custom. They could not avoid the one, but they could contrive to get rid of the other from their churches. Still the notices of the figure of the cross are very numerous.

'not the having, but adoring, and worshipping, images.' Alluding to the picture of the Saviour he distinctly says: 'So is hee in many churches with us, betwixt the Blessed Virgin and St. John. Not the having images is condemned, but the prophaning them to unlawful uses in worshipping and adoring them.'¹ Kellison had charged the Church of England with casting out images. He did not mention the cross, which he certainly would have specified if it had been cast out. We may also be certain that if the figure of our Lord and the Virgin existed in many churches, the cross also remained.²

Undoubtedly more zeal was evinced after Laud's advancement in keeping crosses, and windows, and churches, in repair. He was anxious to keep everything in decent order; but still crosses existed from the Reformation. The controversy with Williams, Bishop of Lincoln, respecting the Communion-table, proves that Laud was no innovator; that he merely preserved such ornaments as existed, though he sometimes restored some which had fallen into decay. Williams admits that the table in his own chapel at Bugden was 'furnished with plate and ornaments above any he had ever seen, the Chapel Royal only excepted.'³ This he says in his assumed character of a Lincolnshire minister. From other sources we have the particulars respecting the ornaments in Williams' chapel: 'Besides the altar so furnished there are to be seene many goodly pictures—as the picture of the Passion, and likewise of the Holy Apostles, together with a faire crucifix, and our Blessed Lady and St. John set up in painted glasse in the east window just over the holy table or sacred altar.'⁴

That even a crucifix existed in Williams' own chapel we have the most abundant evidence, though such a custom was an exception to the rule of almost all churches, which retained only the

¹ Montagu's *Gagge for the Newe Gospell*, 1624, pp. 299, 303.

² James the First took a very sensible view of these matters; for when the people in Scotland said that 'the organs came first, now the images, and ere long we should have the mass,' because some pictures were introduced into the Chapel Royal, his Majesty replied, that persons who could not distinguish between pictures intended for ornaments, and images erected for adoration, were justly chargeable with ignorance. 'You can endure lions, dragons, and devils,' said the King, 'to be figured in your churches, but will not allow the like place to the patriarchs and apostles.'—*Spottiswood*, 530.

³ *The Holy Table: Name and Thing, &c.*, 1637, p. 12. Williams merely wrote to oppose Heylin. His own practice was the same as Laud's. At a later period the charge of popery was alleged against Williams on the ground of this very book. It occurs in a most extraordinary work by Dey, *Two Looks over Lincoln*; or, *a View of the Holy Table, &c.*, *Discovering his Popish Tenets*, 1641. A thorough-paced zealot will discover Popery in the most harmless things. Dey is a type of some modern controversialists, who allege the charge of popery against others, while they themselves are constantly breaking their own solemn oaths by their violation of the Church's express orders.

⁴ *Pocklington's Altare Christianum*, 1637, p. 87.

cross. Some of the Puritans confounded the two, and called the cross a crucifix, charging the bishops with favouring the latter, while they merely encouraged the former. Henry Burton, that most violent incendiary, says: 'To bring our new rites to this rule, doe they make to the advancement of God's glory? What! superstitious, idolatrous worship of wooden altars? A complimentary crouch to Jesus when they crucifie Christ? To bow before a crucifix?' 'The wooden altar was the table: the crucifix was the cross. So again: 'Our new reformers are tooth and nayle for setting up Popery againe: witnesse their hoysing up altars in most places, as also of images, crucifixes, with adorations.' 'Our changers do plead that they do bring in no changes, but revive those things which ancient canons have allowed and prescribed—as standing up at *Gloria Patri*, and at the reading of the Gospel; placing of images in churches; erecting of crucifixes over the altars.' He asks: 'Must the cathedrals in Oxford—I mean those College churches—become the nurseries of idolatry, because of late days they have erected goodly new altars, images, crucifixes? Must other churches have organs, altars, images, crucifixes, tapers, copes, and the like, because such is the guise of cathedrals?'¹

Burton enumerates as popish several things ever retained in the Church, and some which are now allowed even by Dissenters, who call themselves the descendants of the Puritans. But besides these he mentions the crucifix, evidently meaning the cross. The cross, however, as is clear from Burton's charge, was usually above or behind the communion-table, and was either of wood, stone, or metal, or wrought on tapestry. In his reply to these charges, Heylin says: 'For images in churches and crucifixes over the altars, finde you of all loves that the Church hath any where commanded them, or the prelates in their visitations given order for their setting up? So that your answer being thus come to nothing, the objection by you brought on the Church's part remains unanswerable, viz., that the prelates have brought in no changes, but only have revived those things which the ancient Canons have allowed and prescribed, the law of God and the King, and the Act of

¹ Burton's *For God and the King*, 1637, pp. 66, 158, 162, 163. In another work, written by Burton, as he acknowledges in his *Grand Impostor Unmasked*, though published anonymously, he alleges the same charge respecting the crucifix. The Liturgy is branded as popish, as well as the 'rich copes,' and 'faire crucifixes,' and 'loud-sounding organs.' From one expression it may be inferred that sometimes a cross was suspended over the table on the wall, for in speaking of altars he uses the terms, 'and that which hangs over them.' In another place he calls this 'a crucifix over the altar.' He asks: 'Is there no idolatry in bowing before your crucifixes over your altars?' He condemns the singing also, because it shortened the sermon. Thus he speaks of the 'halfe-houre sermons.' See 'A Replie to a Relation of a Conference between William Laud and Mr. Fisher. By a Witnessse of Jesus Christ. Imprinted Anno 1640,' pp. 66, 84, 335, 340, 344, 395.

'Parliament, either enabling them to doe so, or not gainsaying it.' Heylin has hit the mark, namely, that the law, while it does not prescribe, does not prohibit, the use of the cross.

The charge of setting up crucifixes is repeated in numerous works of those times: and it is important, as proving the existence of crosses, which the Puritans, in order to excite odium, designated crucifixes. In a notorious publication, ascribed to Prynne, which abounds in lies on almost every page, the charge is repeated. We have the following marginal notes: 'Witness their alterations of the Gunpowder Treason-Book, their pleading for the Pope, and setting up altars, images, crucifixes.'² In other publications of this bitter and foul-mouthed author we meet with constant allusions to the crucifix. 'Our prelates would have all men bowe and cringe to altars, images, crucifixes.' 'We must have images, crucifixes,' &c. 'They cry for altars, images, crucifixes. They are not content to set up altars and crucifixes. Men must bow downe and worship the golden images, the crucifixes, images. Commanding to set up images, crucifixes. We must have images and crucifixes.' The charge of Popery is alleged on the ground of 'images, crucifixes, and crosses.' 'The Archbishop of Canterbury hath erected altars, images, crucifixes, in the chappels of Lambeth, Croydon, London House, Fulham. The Bishop of Litchfield set up a monstrous crucifix, as bigge and large as any three men.' 'That good man, S. Godfrey, of Gloster, hath also erected a crucifix.'³ In another publication we have the charge of setting up 'crosses and crucifixes.'⁴ The Bishop of Gloucester is charged with setting up 'a new crosse at Windsor with a glorious large crucifixe, not fearing to write thereon, in capital letters, This cross was repaired Anno Domini 1635.' This cross, therefore, existed previously; but Prynne argues that it was forbidden by the Homilies and Injunctions, which 'our cross-erecting prelates have often subscribed, and therefore are worthy of no painted but a real crosse themselves.' Prynne therefore would have used the prelates with greater severity than that with which he himself was treated. But he is a witness in our case, and an impartial one. He proves the existence of crosses before his own times. Alluding to the sentences probably sometimes inflicted in the Star Chamber, he charges the bishops with crucifying 'Christ in his image and saints, which makes them so much in love with the sight of the crucifix.'⁵

In another work of the same period, probably written by

¹ Heylin's Briefe and Moderate Answer, 1637, pp. 171, 172.

² *News from Ipswich, &c.*—Printed at Ipswich.

³ Prynne's Looking Glasse for Lordly Prelates, 1636, pp. 16, 17, 33, 34, 36, 43.

⁴ Breviate of the Prelates' Usurpations, 1637, p. 320.

⁵ Looking Glasse, &c., pp. 50, 65.

Prynne, the bishops are condemned for 'their altars, crucifixes,' &c. The writer recommends '*a Quo Jure* to examine by what law they have turned Communion-tables into altars, and set up crucifixes.' The Last Supper is considered, he says, to be useless, 'unlesse there be a crucifixe there standing on or over the altar.' Cathedrals, churches, and chapels, 'wherein they have set up crosses to crucify their Saviour,' are, he thinks, forfeited to the king. Even their bishoprics ought to be forfeited, 'which they better deserve to lose for erecting crucifixes, altars, tapers, than any godly ministers to be deprived for not wearing the surplesse.' Yet all the vestments, in the writer's estimation, were as popish as the cross; for he asks: 'Whether the prelates, for disguising themselves with strange vestments, as rochets, copes, stoles, and dancing and playing the mummers, piping organs and minstrelsy, before their new-erected altars, hopping like the pagan priests, or like mummers about a cobloose, &c., be not finable and to be imprisoned?'

In these extracts there is a strange jumble or confusion: but the passages prove the existence of many crosses, which the writers chose to call crucifixes. The crucifix did not exist, except in a few places, or sometimes in windows, while the cross was common in every part of the country, and had continued from time immemorial. This fact has been established beyond dispute: but much evidence still remains to be adduced.

The case of Smart at Durham was notorious. In 1628 he preached a sermon in that cathedral. It was published during the same year, and was chiefly directed against Cosin, the Dean. A few passages will serve our purpose:—'The masse coming in, brings with it an inundation of ceremonies, crosses, crucifixes, images, copes, and candlesticks; all which we have seen in this Church since the Communion-table was turned into an altar.' 'If religion consist in altar-ducking, cross-wearing, organ-playing, setting basons on the altar, candlesticks and crucifixes, we had never more religion than now.'

¹ Now Quæres proposed to our Lord Prelates, printed in the year 1637, pp. 10, 11, 13—15. Donne had a very different idea of a simple cross:—

'Since Christ embraced the crosse itself, dare I
His image, the image of his crosse deny,
Who from the picture would avert his eye,
How would he fly his pains who there did die!'

Donne's Poems, 1639, pp. 342, 343.

² The Vanitie and Downfall of Superstitious Popish Ceremonies, 1628, pp. 11, 23, 24. Sometimes it is attempted to prove that copes are not enjoined by the Rubric, which sends us to the second year of King Edward; yet Baxter and the Nonconformists, who acted an honest part in leaving the Church, in the simple exercise of their common sense, admitted that they were included. 'The Liturgy requireth that such ornaments of the Church, &c. The canon of the same Church expoundeth their meaning, Can. 58. We suppose, in the 2d of King Edward VI, the cope, alb, and other vestments were in use.'—Baxter's Nonconformist's Plea for Peace, p. 190. •

In 1641, Smart brought his case before Parliament, with many accusations against Cosin. In 1629 he wrote an account of what he called the Innovations at Durham, but it was not published until 1641. He asserts, that the innovations commenced in 1617, under the new Bishop, Neal: and he dates the commencement from Durham of the corruptions 'which have spread over all the Cathedral Churches; yea, and many parish churches have set up altars, images, and organs. The velvet cloth for the Communion-table,' he says, 'was embroidered with images;' and 'a golden pall' had 'the false story of the Assumption of our Lady.' A stone altar is mentioned with 'crosses, crucifixes, basons, tapers, and candlesticks,' none of which, he says, existed before 1617. He alleges, that sixty wax candles were on one occasion 'on and about the altar burning at one time, and images and angels set up aloft round about the quire, with abominable and ribald copes. Can such paltry toys bring to our memory Christ and his blood-shedding? Crosses, crucifixes, tapers, candlesticks, gilded angels, painted images, golden copes, sumptuous organs, piping so loud at the Communion-table, that they can be heard halfe a mile from the Church.' He admits that in previous times copes were worn, 'decent, as the canons prescribe, not party-coloured nor pibald, like ours at Durham, but plaine, without any picture or other embroidery of crosses or images.'

Cosin met the charges before the Parliament, which could make nothing of the matter, a proof that Smart had acted the part of a slanderer. In the charges exhibited to the Commons, it was stated that certain images 'with the picture of Christ,' which had been mutilated in Queen Elizabeth's days, were 'repaired and most gloriously painted.' It was alleged that Cosin had purchased a cope from a priest. He denied that 'he erected an altar of stone, or that he brought in any of the copes, images, and pictures.' All these things existed long before. The images and pictures had been in the church before the memory of man. The figures of angels, the only figures in the church, had 'existed several hundred years, and the wood work was merely repaired by the Dean and Chapter. Smart called this a setting up of images.

¹ A Short Treatise of Altars, Altar-Furniture, Altar-Cringing, and Musick of all the Quire, &c. when the Holy Communion was administered in the Cathedral Church of Durham, by Prebendaries and Petty Canons, in glorious Copes embroidered with Images, 1629. It is unpagined in the introduction, from which the first and second extracts are taken, pp. 1, 2, 10, 19. Smart regarded the organ as popish as the cross. According to his notions, the Homilies forbid 'piping and cringing, and playing on the organ,' pp. 4, 8. If Smart's notion be correct, Dr. Lushington will have enough to do in removing organs, which, whether forbidden or not by the Homilies, are certainly not enjoined by any law; so that, according to the doctrine of the Consistorial Court, they must be unlawful.

The lights were only used at Evening Service in the winter, for the use of the clergy and choristers. The matters alleged as innovations were as old as the time of the Reformation. This was satisfactorily proved, and so Cosin escaped.¹

We now approach the period of the Long Parliament, under whose fanatical sway many of our churches were not only stripped of their ornaments, but almost ruined, in their zeal against what they called monuments of superstition and idolatry. Dr. Lushington would have us believe that the crosses destroyed by the Long Parliament were recent erections under the influence of Laud. Before he pronounced his decision, he certainly should have better studied our history. That vast numbers of crosses existed in 1640 he will not deny; but he chooses to consider them as innovations. We have the record of the destruction of large numbers in various parts of the kingdom during the Civil Wars, so that in 1640 they must have been general. We find them alluded to in various ways. Warmstry advocates their removal, on the ground that they might be a scandal to the Jews. 'The material crosses in our churches may be a block in their way as well as the cross of Christ.'² Crosses, therefore, were common at this period; and they were not new erections, as we have fully proved. In this speech we find an allusion to lighted candles by day in some churches: but doubtless, the cases admit of the same explanation as those at Durham. 'The crucifixes are already upon the altar, on the tapestry, on the walls, on the glasse windows in faire and large figures,' says Bailly, one of the Scots ministers, in London.³ He found them

¹ An Illustration of Neale's History in the Article of Peter Smart, 1736, pp. 85, 92, 93, 95, 99, 101. Diurnal Occurrences, 1641, pp. 52—56. Fuller's Church History, lib. xi. 173. Heylin's Examen, pp. 284—293. Cosin was charged with Popery; yet he stood his ground in exile, while some of his accusers in England became Papists. The truth is, they had no fixed principles, and took refuge in Rome, while he remained steadfast in the truth, being the same man at all times, because his views were sound. The risks to which he was exposed on the Continent, in consequence of his attachment to the Church of England, are detailed by Nalson, who had the particulars from Cosin's own lips.—Nalson's Collections, vol. i. pp. 519, 520, 568, 789—792. The reckless proceedings of the Commons were more manifest, perhaps, in the case of Laud than in anything else. The subject is too extensive for discussion: but we may allude to an Order of March, 1644, that Prynne should publish an account of the trial. 'It were well,' says the Perfect Diurnal, 'it were printed in all languages and sent abroad, for the sermon he made when he lost his head is translated into several languages, and published in all Christendome. Such is the diligence of the enemy to get advantages.'—Perfect Diurnal, 663.

² Warmstry's Convocation Speech against Images, Altars, Crosses, &c., 1641, p. 4.

³ A Parallel, or Briefe Comparison of the Liturgie with the Masse Book. By B. B. 1641, p. 58. In this inquiry we have not entered upon the question relative to the material of which the altar is to be formed. We view it, however, as a matter of indifference; and our belief is that it was so regarded by the

in the churches, and censured the practice, not caring whether the crosses were new or old.

The evidence during the period on which we have now entered is most copious. As early as 1641, an ordinance was issued by the Commons against monuments of superstition, among which are enumerated the crucifix, images of the Virgin, tapers, and candlesticks. The ordinance was repeated, with some additions, in 1643, though at this time the work of destruction had proceeded to a very great extent. The cross is not mentioned in the former ordinance, from which circumstance we infer that the feeling against it had not then arrived at its full proportion, confining itself to the crucifix and images. The rabble, however, soon gathered themselves up for the work, being encouraged by the saints in Parliament, and by the disaffected clergy. Westminster Abbey, though Williams was its Dean, was assailed; and the monuments, the organs, and the windows, were demolished. The desecration of other cathedrals followed in rapid succession. A few passages from contemporary accounts may serve as specimens of the reforming rage which had then seized upon the rabble, and upon many of the clergy. In the Iconoclasts of that day, our present Church

Church. The following extract from a very able writer deserves the attention of those who are called to sit in judgment on such questions. 'Whatever difference is, or hath been, about the name, I think there need be little about the matter or material, whether it be made of wood or stone; for an altar may be made of wood to serve the turn of *Papists*, as a table may be made of stone for the use of *Protestants*.'—Staveley's History of Churches in England, p. 209. The Reformers continued to use the same chalices which they had used in the mass, and to wear the same surplices, not regarding the abuse of a thing as rendering it unlawful. An able writer, speaking of Beza, says, 'He holds it not necessary that the same Altar which hath bene abused unto Popish idolatry should be altered: but that it may serve as well as a table for the use of the Sacrament: in which judgment diverse martyrs in Queene Maries Dayes concurred, who were content to use the same surplices and chalices which had bene used in the Popish masse.'—Bishop Leslie's Treatise on the Church, 1639, p. 137. The same author, in reference to the Puritans in 1639, says, 'If the Papists be guilty of corporeal idolatry in worshipping of images, the Puritans are guilty of Spiritual idolatry in worshipping their own imaginations.'—*Ib.* p. 171. A very learned author, in a sermon in the year 1605, alludes to the old surplices, to which the Puritans objected, because they had been worn by the priests under the reign of Popery. 'In all likelihood all those surplices are consumed and worne away, and not now used in the Church of England.' In another place he says, 'not many of Queene Maries surplices do now remaine, and if they did, the matter were soone remedied, and time itself in short time would wear them away.'—Mason on the Authority of the Church, pp. 42, 44. The Puritans first objected to the surplice altogether; then to the particular surplices which had been used by the priests under the rule of Popery. The same learned writer says elsewhere of the cross: 'We approve of Litanies as much as ye do; and we are not against the ensign of the cross, provided it be not superstitiously used. And in the use of images we come nearer to Augustine than yourselves. He commends the historical use of images; and so do we commend them: but he condemns the worshipping of them: and so do we also condemn them.'—Mason's Vindication of the Church of England, p. 73.

Reformers may see their own pictures, for our churches would not fare much better now could some amongst us obtain the fulfilment of their wishes.

'They made an Order at a Committee for demolishing all pictures, and the defacing of glasse windows, with the like idolatries; and perhaps churches will come next as having beene abused in former times to superstitious and idolatrous uses.' Somewhat later we read, 'It was advertised this day from Peterborough, that Colonel Cromwell had bestowed a visit on that little city, plundering a great part thereof, and, in pursuance of the thorow Reformation, he did most miserably deface the Cathedral, break downe the organs, destroy the glasse windows.' 'April 25th, a Committee, thereto authorized by the House of Commons, and guarded by a band of soldiers, purged S. Margaret's Church of all the scandalous pictures (that is, all painted glasse) in the windows.' 'According to the order of the House of Commons, all the glasse windows in the Cathedral Church of Westminster, whereon was any imagery, were defaced and broken.' 'To show their hatred to idolatrie, they have broke downe the glasse windows of many churches, thrown down the pictures of Christ, taken the surplices to make frockes to preserve their clothes when they dressed their horses; and in Worcester they have done what I am ashamed to speak, made the pulpit and the font their house of office, as I was informed by one of the gravest Doctors; thrown down the organs, and taken the pipes and copes of the Prebends, and gone about the streets, with the copes on their backs and the pipes in their hands, dancing the morris-dance.'²

It is curious to mark how these Church Reformers jumbled

¹ *Mercurius Aulicus*, 1642, pp. 217, 218, 228, 231. Soldiers were quartered in the Abbey, who 'brake down the rayl and burnt it: they brake down the organ and pawned the pipes at several ale-houses. They put on some of the singing-men's surplices, and ran up and down the church—he that wore the surplice being the hare, the rest were the hounds.'—*Mercurius Rusticus*, p. 236.

² *The Discovery of Mysteries, &c.* By G. Williams, Bishop of Ossory. Printed in the year 1643, pp. 46, 47. 'After this the House of Commons fell upon abolishing innovations in the Church, as pulling down the rayles, taking away images, crucifixes, &c.' *Diurnal Occurrences*, 1641, pp. 354, 359, 360. *Vicars' Parliamentary Chronicle*, Part I. pp. 42, 43. *Heylin's Presbyterians*, pp. 464, 465. *Nalson's Collections*, ii. p. 482. After the Ordinance it was resolved by the Lords, in September, 1641, that existing rails were not to be removed, while others were not to be erected: that steps in chancels raised within fifteen years should be levelled; and that 'crucifixes, scandalous pictures of any of the persons of the Trinity, are to be abolished.' *Nalson*, ii. 483, 484. This was an attempt at compromise by the Lords: but it proves that some things existed from an early period. This is clear in the order to remove recent erections, which implied that some were not recent, and thus our position is confirmed.—*Mercurius Civicus*, p. 110. *Rushworth*, iii. 358.

together all sorts of things as Popish—as organs, surplices, and crosses. ‘Sir John Lamb and Sir Nathaniel Brent were questioned for enjoying the repaying of organs, and setting up new organs in churches.’¹ ‘After this manner was the Cathedral of Exeter served, where the Commandments were defaced, the Common Prayer-book burnt, the glasse windows, monuments, statues, and organs broke; and the name of Jesus, over the Communion-table, blotted out as superstitious. Nor can some honest people of London yet forget the intolerable actions of the saint-like soldiers at St. Peter’s, Paul’s Wharf (Sunday, 9th September, 1647), who rode into the church with swords drawn.’ At Chichester, ‘The organs and Ten Commandments were broke down. The ancient Cathedral of Durham can yet show her ruins.’²

At Cambridge, the havoc was most tremendous, under Will Dowsing, the leader of the mob. ‘Nor was it any whit strange to find whole bands of soldiers training in the Chapel of King Henry VI. One who calls himself John Dowsing, and by virtue of a pretented commission, goes about the country like a Bedlam, breaking glasse windows, having beaten downe all our painted glasse, defaced and digged up the floors of our chappels, many of which had lien so for two or three hundred yeares, compelled us, by armed soldiers, to pay forty shillings a Colledge for not mending what he had defaced.’³

These extracts are from friends of the Church, who detailed scenes of which they were eye-witnesses. Such evidence, however, standing alone, would be questioned by some of our

¹ Diurnal Occurrences, p. 41. Foulis’s Presbyterians, p. 86.

² Foulis’s Presbyterians, pp. 137, 138. Mercurius Rusticus, p. 241. ‘Nor did the famous organs escape their fury, being pulled to pieces and employed to private uses; as one at York something advanced his houses (if my memory fails me not) with organ and church wood.’—Ibid. The following scenes were acted at Chelmsford, in 1641:—‘When this order came out, there was standing in the chancel a goodly faire window at the east end, untouched from the first foundation of the Church, in which was painted the History of Christ, from his conception to his ascension. In obedience to the order, the churchwardens tooke downe the pictures of the blessed Virgin, and of Christ on the Crosse.’ This, however, was not sufficient. ‘The Sectaries, that they might make a thorough reformation, on the 5th of November, in the evening, assembled, and in a riotous manner, with long poles and stones beat down and defaced the whole window.’—Mercurius Rusticus, pp. 22, 23. St. Paul’s is mentioned in the Perfect Diurnal, p. 190. It had been the custom in Twickenham Church to break two large loaves in the church on Easter Sunday. This was deemed superstitious, and the practice was abolished—Perfect Diurnal, p. 699.

³ Querela Cantabrigiensis, pp. 17, 18. Dowsing’s Journal affords abundance evidence of his zeal against crosses. One entry will suffice to show the character of his proceedings. ‘March 20, we break forty superstitious pictures, two crucifixes; order a cross to be taken from the steeple, and the steps to be levelled.’ Dowsing and his fellows pleaded conscience, as some of our modern reformers plead. Dowsing’s Journal has been printed several times.

modern reformers, who prefer the testimony of a Presbyterian or Dissenter to that of a Churchman. But we have abundance of evidence from the self-styled saints, the actors in these iniquitous proceedings. William Culmer has left to posterity an account of his own doings in one of the most singular works of that fanatical period. In 1640, a Petition was presented to the Commons from Canterbury, in which 'Service in Prick-song, and Chanting,' are mentioned as Popish. The Altar was 'dressed after the Romish fashion, with candlesticks, and tapers, &c., for which Altar they have lately provided a most idolatrous costly glory-cloth, or back-cloth.' They mention 'a carved image of the Holy Ghost in the form of a dove,' and 'a carved image of Christ.' Culmer describes the Cathedral as it existed before he commenced his work of destruction, and then its fall: 'On the 26th of August, 1642, some zealous troopers, after they had taken the ammunition out of that malignant Cathedral, fought with the Cathedral gods, namely, altars, images, service-books, pricke-song-books, surplissses, and organs. They slasht some images, crucifixes, and pricke-song-books, and a ragged smock of the whore of Rome, called a surplisse, and began to play the tune of the "Zealous Soldier" on the organs, or case of whistles, which never were in tune since.'¹ This was in 1642: but Culmer did not think this reformation sufficient. 'This was but a forerunner of a more orderly and thorough reformation, which (according to another pious ordinance) began upon the 13th day of December last. The worthy mayor put on that blessed work of

¹ Notwithstanding the troubles from 1640 to 1660, and the disappointment of the Presbyterians in not getting the Idol of Presbytery set up, they were not cured of their hatred to the Church of England at the Restoration. Thus, in a most singular work, in 1660, we read, 'Upon the 5th November, 1660, two great hogges came two severall and very unusual wayes up divers steps into the Cathedrall of Canterbury, and went into the quire when the prebends were in the midst of their devotion, and there continued till they were driven out by the vergers. The generality of the inhabitants do very well remember that a little before the downfall of the hierarchy, in the year 1641, the same thing happened in the same place. *Malum Omen.*' *Mirabilis Annus; or, the Year of Prodigies, and Wonders, &c.* Printed in the year 1661, p. 50. This work, printed before the Act of Uniformity, when the Presbyterians and Sectaries retained their Churches without conforming to the Liturgy, abounds in stories of judgments upon those who began to read the Common Prayer. It is scarcely credible, that men professing godliness should have given their sanction to such notorious lies for the purpose of stirring up a feeling against the Book of Common Prayer. One Clergyman, according to this scandalous production, was struck dead in the act of reading in the Church. The Bishop of Oxford was nearly killed while in the act of Confirmation at Christ Church. Dr. Barton Holiday 'fell down and hit his face against the chalice' in administering the wine. One man was nearly destroyed by a dog on the morning of the execution of Hugh Peters, and fearful sights were seen above the quarters of the regicides suspended over the city gates. Pp. 5, 6, 76, 77, 85. Several apparitions were seen in the air, of Cathedrals, 'some burning, others rent and torn, others subverted, with the pinnacles downwards.'—*Ibid.* 17.

' reformation. When the commissioners entered upon the execution of that ordinance they knew not where to begin, the images and pictures were so numerous. Coming to the east window, the first picture was of Austin, the monk; and so it casually fell out that the image of this arch-prelate was the first that was demolished. Many window-images, or pictures in glasse, were demolished that day, and many idols of stone.' The commissioners fell to work on the great idolatrous window on the left hand. 'In that window was now the picture of God the Father, and of Christ, besides a large crucifixe and seven large pictures of the Virgin Mary. As that window was the superstitious glory of that Cathedral, so now it is more defaced than any window.' He mentions 'a minister with a pike in his hand rattling down proud Becket's glassy bones. Some wished he might break his neck: but he finished his work, and came down well, and was in very good health when this was written. Many other images were defaced, several pictures of crucifixes, and men praying to crucifixes, and to the Virgin Marie. When the cathedral men heard that ordinance against idolatrous monuments was to be put in execution, they covered a complete crucifixe in the sermon-house windows with boards, and painted them to preserve the crucifixe, but their juggling was found out and the crucifixe demolished.'¹

Culmer himself was the minister who battered down the glass with a pike. The circumstance is alluded to in a contemporary pamphlet. 'Having what he long wished for, an opportunity of revenge, under pretence of letting in new lights, he falls to threshing down the old, their much-admired; but since the Reformation never till then abused windows;

¹ Cathedral Newes from Canterbury, &c. Recorded by Richard Culmer. London, 1644, pp. 2, 3, 19, 20—24. These scenes are largely described by Vicars, who says that they 'destroyed many crucifixes' in the Cathedral.—Parliamentary Chronicle, Part III. p. 101.—Heylin's *Presbyterians*, p. 452. As a set off to the descriptions by the actors, the following just picture may be given:—'After all the clamour about religion, the care of it was now transferred from a Convocation to a new assembly of Divines, and from them transferred to the House of Commons, and from thence to the mob, between whom the regular clergy suffered such a persecution, and the churches such a deformation, as is hardly to be paralleled, even in the Pagan Annals. For, in all places within the power of the rebel Reformers, all the monuments of superstition (as Church-ornaments especially were then called) were defaced, and the loyal and orthodox clergy harassed, plundered, imprisoned, and sequestered as malignants and Papists, by men who were open rebels themselves, actually managed by Popish engines, and favourers even of the Alcoran itself: whose committees were no less cruel than the severest inquisition. And treachery and hypocrisy, licentiousness and profaneness, enthusiasm and atheism, together with a violation of all the laws of nature and humanity, were the natural effects of such a revolution.'—Lindsay's *History of England*, p. 286.

'and to clear the place of monuments of superstition, down go crowned kings for canonized saints; and, to show whose son he was, he knocks down Christ and spares the devil. A young gentleman observing from without his wild zeal within, ironically falls to applauding of the action, telling him that he would help him; and thereupon, catching up a good thumping stone, takes his aim at the place where the pike-man was standing, mounted on his Haman-like ladder.' This points to Culmer as the man with the pike mentioned in his own narrative.

None of these things were of recent introduction: they had remained from the Reformation. Some of the actors in these scenes mention the fact, that the images and pictures had not been removed at the Reformation; and their testimony will be received by such men as the Pimlico Reformers. 'Besides the long-desired, and now happily-effected ruine and razing down of Popish high places, never since the first Reformation till now taken away, in defacing and destroying Popish images, organs, crosses, crucifixes, and such-like abominable and idolatrous superstitions, Popish and apish trinkets, both in churches and elsewhere.' Here is the testimony of a man of that day flatly contradictory to Dr. Lushington's assertion. 'Vicars, who knew whether the crosses destroyed were recent erections, affirms that they had never been removed. This same writer gives us a most graphic account of other scenes, Of the Cathedral at Lichfield, he says—'But take this note by the way, that though the soldiers were merciful to the men, yet were they void of all pity toward the organ pipes, copes, and such like Popish trumperies.' He mentions the destruction of crosses, pictures, and images.' Of Westminster he says, 'Now the Popish Altar is quite taken away, the bellowing organs are demolisht. For the gaudy gilded crucifixes, and rotten rabble of dumbe idolls, Popish saints and pictures set up and placed where that sinful singing was used, now a most sweet assembly and thick throng of God's pious people, and well-affected living teachable saints, are there constantly and most comfortably every morning to be seen at sermons.'

¹ Culmer's Crown Crackt with His own Looking-Glasse; or, the Cockscombe's Looking Glasse broken about his Ears, &c. pp. 3, 4. Calamy says, 'It was he that brake the great window there, at which many were enraged against him.' Calamy speaks of him and his violent proceedings in these gentle terms—'He was one of those appointed by authority of Parliament to detect, and cause to be demolished, the superstitious inscriptions and idolatrous monuments in the Cathedral there.'—Calamy's Account, &c., ii. p. 389.

² Vicars' Looking Glasse for Malignants, 1643, p. 9.

³ Vicars' Parliamentary Chronicle, Part I. p. 273, 327. Part III. p. 185. 'December 30, 1643, the High Altar and other superstitious pictures and crucifixes in King Henry VII. Chapel were taken away.'—Ibid. p. 113.

In 1644, the Commons issued another Ordinance to enforce that of the previous year. 'Copies, surplices, crosses, crucifixes, pictures, organs and their frames,' were to be utterly destroyed.¹ Organs are always specified; and the evidence which proves their existence in churches, prior to 1640, proves also the existence of crosses. Organs must stand or fall with crosses, since neither are recognised by law.

In that scandalous performance, 'White's Century'—scandalous to its author, on account of its abominable lies—we meet incidentally with evidence of the existence of crosses in windows, which had continued since the Reformation. Had they been of recent introduction, the slanderous writer would have mentioned the circumstance as an aggravation of the offence. The charge against the Vicar of Maching, in Essex, was this: 'He hath often refused the Lord's Supper to such as refused to come to the rails, there being a crucifix in the window over the altar, and he would not suffer it to be pulled down, notwithstanding the order of Parliament.' John Mountford was removed from Anstie, Herts, for bowing 'towards a great crucifix and picture of the Virgin Mary, in the east window over the table.' Further 'he did arrest the churchwardens and the glazier for pulling down the said scandalous pictures in obedience to the order of Parliament.' Against Richard Taylor, of Buntingford, was alleged 'a crosse at the head of the font.' Edward Marten, of Houghton Conquest, was charged with 'adoring the altar with his eyes on a crucifixe in the east window.'² In all these cases it is clear that the crosses had long existed; consequently, the Homilies and the Injunctions, in the estimation of their framers, comprehended in their censures only such things as had been abused.

Among the innovations alleged against Laud was the setting up of crosses. 'To begin with his own kennel at Lambeth, we shall lead you into the chapel, and evidence what superstitious pictures, utensils, vestments, be there introduced, never heard of in any of his predecessor's days.' Prynne says that the windows were defaced at the Reformation, 'that naught but a few broken fragments remained,' and that Laud replaced them from patterns in the Missal: 'A large crucifix in the east

¹ Vicars, p. 322, 323.

² White's First Centurie of Scandalous and Malignant Priests, 1643. Pp. 6, 13, 38, 42. Sometimes, indeed, the Reformers of that period pretended that the crosses and pictures were innovations. 'If the times go ten steps further, we shall have a brass nail upon a flat stone as a rare piece of antiquity; and the sight of a bit of red glass go for pence a piece; and indeed it concerns our new Government to get the world into a belief that it was made but in 1640 at farthest.'—Carey's Memoirs of the Civil War, ii. pp. 400, 401.

window taken from the Missal.' In another window, the picture of the Virgin was 'broken by the soldiers by reason of the great scandal it gave unto them.' He mentions 'silver candlesticks and tapers on the altar,' and 'a picture of Christ 'on a piece of arras behind the altar, and a crucifix in the 'window over it.' Standing at *Gloria Patri*, and the organs, are specified as innovations. On the Archbishop's trial it was deposed that there was at Whitehall Chapel 'a peece of arras with a crucifix, never used since Henry VIII. his reigne.' It was produced before the Lords, and was 'very large, naked, scandalous, offensive.' Sir N. Brent deposed that before Laud's chancellorship, 'there were no copes nor crucifixes in 'Oxford, but such as were defaced, or covered with dust, and 'quite neglected;' but that afterwards 'the old crucifixes were 'repaired, adorned, and new crucifixes set up.'¹ This was the substance of the charge against Laud, with respect to the matters relating to our present inquiry.

We take Laud's answer from his own papers. It seems that in Laud's time a new piece of arras was placed in the Chapel at Whitehall. 'The piece of hangings which hung 'constantly at the back of the altar, thirty years together, upon 'my own knowledge (as I offered proof by the vestrymen), 'and so all the time of Sir Henry's being at court, had a 'crucifix in it, and yet his conscience never troubled at it.' This crucifix, therefore, was not introduced by Laud. It was no innovation to substitute a new cloth of the same pattern for the old one. The crucifix had long been there. Of Lambeth he says, 'The crucifix was standing in my predecessor's time, though 'a little broken; so I did but mend it: I did not set it up, as 'was alleged against me.' In reference to the statute of Edward VI. against images, Laud says, 'The contemporary 'practice (which is one of the best expounders of the meaning 'of any law) did neither destroy all coloured windows, though 'images were in them, in the Queen's time, nor abstain from

¹ Prynne's *Canterburie's Doome*, pp. 59, 65, 68, 71. In one of the libellous publications of those days, we have the following account of the Chapel at Whitehall:—'Upon Good Friday, as I came through Whitehall, a countryman had me in to give me a dish of drinke, and then carried me to the King's Quire. When I came, the people were all grovelling on the ground. Downe I was driven on my maribones, and about halfe an hour after, they all stood up, turning their — to the east, and their snouts to the west, to hear an anthem; which being done, a tall thin carle in a long gown made the people turne their faces to the east, where I spied a curious wrought crucifix hanging over the High Altar.' The Scots Scout's Discoveries, London: Printed, 1642, p. 40. Laud's enemies never chose to admit that the crosses existed before his time. Burton says, 'Witnesse the goodly crucifixe over his Altar at Lambeth, Whitehall, and elsewhere.'—Burton's *Grand Impostor*, p. 2.

'setting up new, both in her and in King James his time.'¹ Surely Laud was a better lawyer than Lushington. Had the latter read this important passage, his judgment might have been different. These answers were given by Laud at his trial. They were published by Wharton, and partly by Prynne, who, in his usual style, attempts a reply, though he is unable to refute the Archbishop's statements. Some of the charges involved practices ever recognised by the Church. These the Archbishop admits and defends; and those which bear on our present inquiry were fully answered. Prynne's attempt at a reply only establishes the Archbishop's positions. The accuser could not deny the existence of the crucifix at Whitehall; and his reply is, that 'the old was hardly visible, and scarce observed by any.'² The existence of the thing is admitted, even by Prynne; so that Laud was not an innovator, as Dr. Lushington asserts. From recent proceedings it is evident that the same ignorance, bitterness, misconception, and a disregard of truth, are still inherent in the race of which Prynne may be viewed as the type. The same senseless charge of Popery is still made against Laud by men whose ignorance is only exceeded by their effrontery,—men who are unacquainted with the history of the Church, and who adopt the rash assertions of the Puritans as truths—assertions which Laud had the good sense to despise. Yet these men would be teachers of others. Nay, they would compel all to adopt their own views. Such are our modern reformers among the Clergy, who resolve all ordinances into preaching,—who read little, and think less,—and wish to impose their own rude and rashly-formed opinions on the public as the views of the English Church. Even Andrew Marvel, a Dissenter, is more just to Laud than some of our own clergy, who, as they read but little, speak in total ignorance on all historical subjects. Marvel says of Laud:—'Who, if for nothing else, yet for his learned book against Fisher, deserved far another fate than he met with, and ought not now to be mentioned without due honour.'³ We venture to express our belief that many of the traducers of Laud never heard of his book against Fisher.

Even the satires of these times might have convinced Dr. Lushington of his erroneous impressions respecting crosses. In a curious work of the period, we find a chapter—'How to cure Crosses.'⁴ The writer's prescriptions are not a little

¹ Wharton's *Troubles and Tryals of Laud*, i. pp. 311, 312, 313, 316, 332—334. Bushworth, Part II. pp. 274, 275.

² Prynne's *Canterburie's Doom*, p. 75.

³ *The Rehearsal Transposed*, p. 281.

singular. 'Carry no coyn about with you; for you know that there is an image on one side, and a crosse on the other: and I would have you so much avoid it because you are already prone to worship it, and some think it is the only way to make a Papist on you. Forbear to walk in these forbidden paths, till their names be changed,—White-Crosse Street, Red-Crosse Street, Charin-Crosse, Cow-Crosse, Ratcliffe-Crosse. If any man's name be Crosse, let him change it, and call himself Overthwart, as William Overthwart. I will not wish you to put away all crosse wives, because I would not debar you of the general society of women.' In allusion to the contempt in which churches were held in those reforming times, the writer says:—'If preaching is as sacred in a stable as in a church, why not in a church as well as a stable? If ye do it in remembrance that it was the necessitated place of our Saviour, ye stand in your own light, and confute yourselves; you may with as little idolatric keep in view the form of that whereon he died, as of that where he was born.'¹

¹ Medicine for the Times. By T. J.: London, 1641. An unpaged Tract. If amusement could be experienced on so sad a subject, we might certainly derive much from the proceedings of these strange times, to which some of our modern reformers would drive us if possible. It is a well-known fact, that the Lord's Supper was not administered in some places for twenty years, because the ministers who usurped authority could not agree about the manner of the administration. 'I will make affidavit that some parishes among us have been interdicted from the Lord's Supper by the hirelings that teach them from anno 1642 to 1659; and this famine of the Holy Bread is like to continue among them.'—Hacket's Life of Williams, Part II. p. 107. Hacket was a witness of the scenes of those sad times; but he does not stand alone, for Baxter himself, a Nonconformist, confirmed the statement, saying, that for twenty years the Lord's Supper was not administered in many places, because persons could not agree about the mode of administration. Were our zealous reformers to succeed in their attempts to alter the Liturgy, is it probable that they would proceed better in a new settlement than their predecessors of 1640? Opinions would be so numerous that no two men would agree to worship together. We read in another author, 'How many churches are there where there hath been no speaking of a Sacrament these fifteen or sixteen years?'—History of the English and Scotch Presbytery, 1659, p. 199.

While the publications against Laud and the Bishops prove the existence of Crosses, they also prove the existence of that spirit of detraction which is now so prevalent. The following lines will explain our meaning:—

'But presently they heard strange fables,
The Bishops went to Lambeth with their bables;
Where a new faire was lately consecrate,
For Popish garments that were out of date.
Buy a Crucifix, another loud doth call;
'Twill scare the Devil, and preserve your soule.'
Buy this brave Rochet; buy this curious Cope;
The Tippet, Scarfe, they all came from the Pope.
Then after that unto this jolly faire,
A little wren came flying through the aire,
And on his back betwixt his wings he bore
A Minster staff with crosses, altars, store, .

In another satire we read,—‘ Truly, brother, I am very much
 ‘ offended with a foule superstition, which I wonder is so easily
 ‘ passed over by others: our windmills, you know,* are framed
 ‘ in so perfect a crosse, as if they were erected in defiance of
 ‘ reformation. To what purpose do we banish the crosse out of
 ‘ our churches and markets, if we allow it upon our city walls
 ‘ or in our fields. It is no marvel, if our cornè that is ground
 ‘ with so idolatrous an engine turne to no better nourishment,
 ‘ and serve only to feed wicked humours.’ ‘ If you mark it,
 ‘ they are commonly seated upon high hills that their offence
 ‘ may be the more notorious: my advice therefore is, up with
 ‘ all windmills.’ The writer then proposes an invention of
 a round mill. ‘ Why may there not be a device of a round
 ‘ windmill free from offence? First, it is new, and that, I
 ‘ suppose, is no small praise: away with the rotten fashions of
 ‘ our doting ancestors. Secondly, this is a fashion that hath
 ‘ never been taken up by Papiests or Heathens. I am much
 ‘ afraid lest, when they see the better fashion of our grinding
 ‘ engine, they will go near to conforme, which if they should do,
 ‘ they will soon drive us to seek some other device.’ He pro-
 poses, ‘ that even the horn-book should be rejected, on account
 ‘ of the cross. A good sister of ours, Mistris W., a school-
 ‘ mistris, would not suffer her little ones to make that idol in
 ‘ their first lesson, but taught them to say *black-spot*, instead of
 ‘ Christ’s-Crosse: and our brother, H. L., the baker, in detest-
 ‘ ation of this figure, would not so much as prick his loaves
 ‘ with an headlesse crosse, but contented himselfe with one
 ‘ single motion of his knife.’¹

It is evident that in those days crosses in churches were no
 novelties. The absurd opposition was the novelty. The current,
 however, had set in, and many years elapsed before it was
 checked. Various individuals were summoned before the
 Commons to answer charges of innovations; and the cross was
 always one. In the list of charges against Pocklington, we
 find this: ‘ He hath placed a crosse in a cloth behind the altar,
 called the altar-cloth.’² John Squire, a clergyman, was

* With sacred fonts and rare gilt cherubims,
 And bellwing organs chaunting curious hymnes;
 Wax candles, tapers, another cries and calls,
 These brought I with me from Cathedral Paul’s.

Lambeth Faire, wherein you have all the Bishop’s trinkets set to sale. Printed
 in the yeare 1641. In the woodcuts, Crosses are among the articles exposed
 for sale.

¹ A New Windmill, a New. At Oxford. Printed by Leonard Litchfield, 1643.
 Pp. 8, 4, 5.

² The Petition and Articles against John Pocklington. London: printed in
 the year 1641.

charged with allowing pictures of the Virgin Mary and of our Lord. The parishioners wished to have a crucifix; but Squire refused. His reply to the charge was, that there was a picture of the Virgin, but that he had refused to allow a crucifix.¹ Sherfield's case made a considerable noise, and was urged against Laud. We do not justify his censure; but it was the custom of the times to punish with severity; and the Presbyterians, when they acquired power, far outstripped the Bishops in the race of persecution. Sherfield proceeded to break the figures in the window, on the authority of a parish-vestry. The act, therefore, was illegal. The window could only lawfully be removed with the consent of the Bishop; and on this point the sentence depended. 'For so doing, in contempt of the Bishop, and without any authority, he was fined 1,000 pounds.'²

It is unnecessary to pursue the inquiry beyond the period of the Long Parliament, since crosses are lawful now if they were lawful in 1640. Many were destroyed before the Restoration; but some escaped, and others were restored subsequent to the year 1660. Our object is answered when we have established the fact of their existence, in larger or smaller numbers, from the Reformation to the year 1640, and this we regard as fully proved. If at that time all such matters were within the discretion of the Ordinary, and not affected by any law, they must be regulated by the same authority at the present time. In the times to which we have alluded, every

¹ An Answer to the Articles against John Squire. Printed in the year 1641. In 1637, Squire, in a sermon, which was published, refuted some of the lies in the News from Ipswich. This was enough to render him obnoxious, and to secure his sequestration. The sermon is sufficient to disprove the charge of Popery. See a 'Thanksgiving for the Decreasing and Hope of the Removing of the Plague.' London: 1637. The sermon was preached in S. Paul's Church. Squire states, that Divine Service was then celebrated thrice every day in S. Paul's. Being charged with Popery, he says, 'This Mother Church of S. Paul was built by Ethelbert above a thousand years since, anno 605, long before that Popery, the *Latine Liturgy*, was crept out of the nest, or the Papacie out of the shell.'—Pp. 40, 41.

² Autobiography of Sir John Bramstone, p. 62. Heylin's *Certamen Epistolare*, p. 193. Now, the Attorney-General, said at Sherfield's trial, 'If windows containing memorials of Saints, Prophets, or Jesus Christ, were to be demolished because some men conceived them superstitious, for the same reason they might take upon them to pull down all Cathedral Churches because they are made in the form of a cross.'—*State Trials*, i. p. 585. It would seem that, after all, Sherfield was not influenced by religious feeling in his fury against the window at Sarum, though the act elevated him into a Saint with the Puritans. Thus we are told, 'About this time (1633) died Sherfield, the glass-window breaker, some thousands in debt, and most wickedly cheated those that dealt with him for that little land he had in a manor near Marlborough.' The inconsistency of the man was remarkable, for his land was mortgaged no less than four times; yet, on his death-bed, he sent a key of a box in his room at Lincoln's Inn to Noy, the Attorney-General, in which was a conveyance of an earlier date than the earliest mortgage, by which his estate was devoted to '*pious uses*.'—*Strafford's Letters*, i. p. 206.

thing disliked by the Puritans was branded with the odious name of Popery; and in our day, not a few, even among the Clergy, either from ignorance of the principles of their own Church, or from hostility to those principles, regard many customs as Pöpish which they themselves are pledged in the most solemn manner to observe. In short, many persons are more superstitious in their avoidance of practices which they may dislike, than even Papists in bowing down before the crucifix.

Dr. Lushington's Judgment necessarily militates against all carved figures in churches; yet, since the Restoration, many such things have been erected; and some of the old crosses in windows still remain, having escaped the fury of the parliamentary and military saints. In 1773, several specimens of both kinds were found in Oxford, and probably they still exist. At S. Michael's Church, 'in the east window are detached figures of the Virgin Mary, with her son in her arms. On the north window remains a saint at his devotions.' In the north window of S. Peter's Church was 'a symbol of the Trinity. Above are three figures, and at the top certain others of the Holy Apostles. In another window, a cross quartered. On the middle window, a capital figure of a saint, bearing on his garments crosses.' In the churchwardens' accounts of S. Giles' parish we have this entry:—'1563. Paid for mending the cross.' This cross was probably in the churchyard: yet it was as likely to be an object of superstition there as in the church. But the circumstance shows that the Queen's injunctions were not directed against crosses. In All Saints' Church, a modern erection, 'the altar is richly executed, being a stone, supported by two pilasters, and adorned on each side with two golden cherubims.'

Kennet mentions a rather singular instance of church ornaments in 1708. Describing the chapel erected by the Duke of Devonshire, he says, 'The altar-piece is an admirable frame of white marble and alabaster, supported by two pillars of black

¹ Peshall's Ancient and Present State of Oxford, 1773, pp. 23, 42, 81, 82, 217. If we prove that certain ornaments existed in the last century, our object is gained, whether they now exist or not; since the question is simply whether such things are prohibited, or whether they are within the discretion of the Ordinary. The following extracts prove the existence of Crosses and other ornaments in Cambridgeshire in 1750. 'A large painting of S. Christopher carrying our Saviour, is over the north door.' 'The Altar-piece is wainscot, and in the midst a picture of the Salutation. The cloth for the table is of velvet, on which stand two large silver-gilt candlesticks, &c.' 'The east window, containing the History of Christ's Passion, is very fine and whole, being hid in the late troublesome times.' 'Over the Altar is a fine large picture of Our Lady offering our Saviour in the Temple to the Priest.' These extracts relate to the church of Hinton, and the chapels of Caius, Peter House, and Trinity Hall.—Bloomfield's Collectanea Cantabrigiense, pp. 3, 101, 157, 206.

'marble, adorned with lively statues on the top of each, and with a dove and glory very curiously cut in stone; and over it, in an oval black frame, a picture of S. Thomas convinced of his infidelity.' No cross is mentioned; but all these figures are ornaments, if not images, and according to Dr. Lushington they were, and still are, if they yet remain, unlawful. Hundreds of churches are in the same state. They have altarpieces or carved figures. It appears novel and strange now for the first time to have the cross pronounced to be an unlawful ornament. Even Richard Baxter was not offended at the figure of the cross. Nay, he says of the crucifix, 'It is not unlawful to make an image of a crucifix to be the medium of our considerations, exciting our minds to worship God.'² Upon this passage Stillingfleet remarks, 'If any divine of the Church of England had said anything like this, what outcries of Popery would have been made against us.'³

Notwithstanding the destruction to which all such things were subjected under the Reformers of 1640, many painted windows still remain, and the cross, the sacred emblem of our salvation, is still to be found. Crosses and pictures, or figures, are very numerous in the church of Fairford.⁴ There are twenty-four windows, and all are perfect. When the Long Parliament commenced its work of destruction, these beautiful windows were taken down and concealed, and subsequent to the Restoration they were reinstated in their proper places. To this care on the part of individuals in those distracted times we owe their preservation. In one the Crucifixion is represented; in others the various scenes in the Redeemer's life are described. These representations, though of an early period, were set up after the Restoration; but most of them, on Dr. Lushington's principle, must be unlawful.⁵

¹ Kennet's Sermon at the Funeral of the Duke of Devonshire, 1708, pp. 141, 142. We have not entered upon the question of candlesticks, because they are allowed by Dr. Lushington, though it would be difficult to show that they rest on any authority beyond that which we plead for the use of crosses. But at the period of the Scottish Union candlesticks were so common as to be enumerated among the things which were calculated to offend the Presbyterians. Thus a writer, opposing the Union, says, 'We shall have blind lights, altars, and bowing to the altar.' This writer opposed the Union, among other things, on the ground of the Covenant. 'In the first article we swear to contribute our endeavours to reform England in worship and government, but by the Union we lay an eternal embargo on such endeavours. In the second article we abuse prelacy, and by the Union we establish it.' See a very curious tract, 'Lawful Prejudices against an Incorporating Union with England; or, Considerations on the Sinfulness of this Union.' Edinburgh, printed in the year 1707. Pp. 5, 11.

² Baxter's Christian Directory, pp. 875, 876.

³ Stillingfleet's Unreasonableness of Separation.

⁴ Heylin's Laud, p. 15.

⁵ The History of Fairford Church, in Gloucestershire, 1763. It is curious to

The case of S. Margaret's Church, Westminster, is well known, and it bears especially on our present inquiry. In the year 1757 a sum of money was voted by the House of Commons for the restoration of this church. The window intended for Henry VII.'s Chapel was purchased by the committee appointed to superintend the work, and placed at the east end of the church. From some cause or other the Ordinary, the Dean of Westminster, took offence, and proceeded against the churchwardens, and the charge is almost the same as that recently exhibited in the Consistorial Court. 'They have set up, or suffered to be set up, a certain painted glass over the Communion table, whereon is represented by delineation and colours one or more superstitious picture or pictures, image or images, and more particularly the painted image of Christ upon the Cross; and that they had not a licence or faculty from the Ordinary of the place for so doing.' Such was the charge, and the sting is in its tail, for the Dean of Westminster had not been consulted. After some time the Court of Arches decided that the window was not unlawful, and it still remains in its position. This case might have guided Dr. Lushington to a different decision.¹

trace the gradual introduction of some practices since the Reformation, and the disuse of others. Among the former we may notice communion-rails. They are now universal, though enjoined by no law. But in 1701, when Prideaux wrote, there was no uniformity in the matter, as is clear from the following passage: 'And therefore, for example, the rails at the altar being not required by any law, or of themselves absolutely necessary in any church, as they cannot be first erected without the consent of the parish and parson, and the licence of the ordinary first had thereto, so neither after forty years' disuse can they be again restored without the same consent and licence to authorize the churchwardens to do the thing, and levy a rate upon the parish for it; and therefore, though it be very decent and fitting that there should be rails in every church, to keep the communion-table from profanation, yet since this is a matter which often raiseth great contests and disturbances in parishes among weak and scrupulous persons, it is proper that churchwardens have this advice given them. But here it is to be observed, that the consent of the parish is not required as necessary to authorize the thing, but only to oblige them to pay for the doing of it. Whether it be fitting to be done or no, belongs to the ordinary to judge, but whether the parish will pay anything towards it being wholly in their power. Therefore if the parson or any other person, with the consent of the ordinary, have a desire to set up rails at the altar at their own proper cost and charges, the parish is no way concerned either to give or deny their consent thereto.'—Prideaux's Directions, 1701, p. 8. At this time then altar-rails were not general, but the matter rested with the parson and the ordinary. Can Dr. Lushington, therefore, remove a cross which has been allowed by the incumbent and the bishop, and which is not prohibited by law? But though no law enjoins altar-rails, would not the cry of Popery be raised against any bishop who should venture to consecrate a church without them? Times are now changed; and to remove some things, which at one period were regarded as Popish, would now be considered as an undoubted evidence of Popery.

¹ Wilson's Ornaments of Churches, 1761. A modern writer, alluding to the zeal of some persons against ornaments in churches, says, 'No images but of lions and unicorns are now the embellishments of our churches; and the arms of the

Our task is completed. We will only add, that Dr. Lushington's judgment, if it be regarded as law, will unsettle a vast number of things which have never been disputed, though they are not enjoined by any express law. That some things not expressly enjoined may nevertheless be used, has ever been the opinion of those who have paid attention to this subject. Communion rails are not prescribed, and on Dr. Lushington's principle they are unlawful. Organs and many other things are in the same case. Yet it has ever been allowed that various ornaments in churches, not actually enjoined, may be repaired by the churchwardens. After long disuse, the churchwardens may require the permission of the Ordinary to restore such things; but no one until now has doubted that the bishop had power to replace or set up such ornaments as are not expressly forbidden. Consequently crosses, inasmuch as they are neither enjoined nor prohibited, are within the power and discretion of the bishop; and as the Bishop of London consecrated the church at Pimlico with the cross, and with perfect knowledge of its presence, it is not in Dr. Lushington's power to order its removal.

civil magistrate may stand with applause, where the cross, the arms of our crucified Saviour (if we believe the Calvinist), must be defaced as Popish and idolatrous.'—Lewis on the Consecration of Churches, 1719, pp. 93, 94. Biog. Brit. vi. 4051, 4052.

- ART. III.—1. *History of England from the Fall of Wolsey to the Death of Elizabeth.* By JAMES ANTHONY FROUDE, M. A. Vols. I. and II. London: J. W. Parker & Son. 1856.
2. *The Annals of England: an Epitome of English History, from Contemporary Writers, the Rolls of Parliament, and other Public Records.* Vol. I. Oxford: J. H. Parker. 1855.

IN the volume of 'Oxford Essays,' published about twelve months since, Mr. Froude supported the claims of the 'Statutes at Large' to be regarded as the text-book for the study of English History. He has there forcibly and clearly stated the advantages of reading the history of our own country by the light of these authoritative documents. As to their value for the purposes of education, we fully agree with Mr. Froude. But beyond this, they are of the first importance as the skeleton, or lay figure, for the historian. If there are obvious and great advantages to the educator and the historian, in the calm and careful examination of the mere legislative results of growing tendencies and gradual policy, it must not, however, be concealed that a history written on this principle will be likely to put out of sight much of that real living action which is above and out of the reach of law, and of which statutes of Parliament are an inadequate representation. Whether from a too rigid attention to his own theory, or from circumstances arising out of his distance from large libraries, Mr. Froude's book, in our opinion, fails to give us a sufficient insight into the springs and workings of political and social life. It is some gain, indeed, to find these neglected materials taking their proper place in the ~~man~~ of kingly biographies, and the wearisome roll of military and diplomatic achievements. What we search for in vain in these volumes, is a sufficient acquaintance with the life of the people, the state of the country, and that shifting temper of the nation which outruns law, and gives a terrible energy to a chafed and neglected will.

There is another disadvantage with which Mr. Froude has to contend. National life has so few real resting-places, that the historian of a single and limited period is tempted from the nature of his subject to make imaginary starting-posts, and to fancy that to be a *mirabilis annus*, which is, in fact, only important because it happens to be the date from which he has chosen to commence his history. To remedy this, most writers find it necessary to sketch, more or less vaguely, the past history, and to picture, as well as can be pictured in brief, the existing condition of the nation. The opening chapters in Mr. Froude's first

volume are wholly taken up with this rapid survey; but that defect which is almost inherent in all such summaries, is too apparent in the volumes before us. They do not give such an insight into temper and motive, into inner feelings and outward circumstances, as suffices to explain the events which succeeded each other in such portentous rapidity. Mr. Froude has, indeed, made good use of public records, many of which have been hitherto unused. He has carefully collated the narratives of ambassadors, and has arranged with industry the state papers of the period, leaving these documents, as he himself says, almost to tell their own tale; but, with the exceptions of an interesting volume published by Archdeacon Hale, and some valuable papers discovered by Sir Francis Palgrave, he has scarcely availed himself of those far more important records which are to be met with in the bye-ways of history, and which, though often minute and trivial, and domestic in character, enable us to disentangle so much that is perplexed, and to understand so much of what would otherwise be inexplicable. Whoever would build up a monument to himself in the shape of a real history of a living people, whilst he studies the public writings to which we have referred, must give a large portion of his days and nights to domestic correspondence, to 'household books,' to private diaries, to the wills, the songs, and the whole individual and common life literature of the age. This is more especially true of such periods as that which Mr. Froude has selected. When a nation is in a ferment, the causes of action are oftener to be gathered from its accidental and indirect confessions than from its formal state papers. He has shown, it is true, that the Reformation, which is, of course, the central group on his canvas, had but little dependence upon the accidents which accompanied it; but from a neglect of what we may be allowed to call the undesigned sources of history, he has not sufficiently made apparent the hollowness of the whole fabric of ecclesiastical society, and the fearful consequences of that delay in the reformation in Church and State which had been, for at least two centuries, clamoured for from one end of Europe to the other.

Whilst regretting these defects, it would be unjust not to indicate some of the excellencies of the volumes before us. In favourable contrast to the wearisome glitter of Mr. Macaulay, and the harsh mannerism of Mr. Carlyle, Mr. Froude's style is singularly clear and forcible. Incidents are grouped by him with picturesque effect; and whilst he writes with the earnestness of deep conviction, his narrative, even when necessarily brief, is remarkable for its precision. The chapter on early Irish politics and history, may be pointed out as combining these ex-

cellencies, whilst it possesses a value of its own from the insight it gives into the causes and origin of Irish grievances. With some of his opinions in ecclesiastical matters we cannot be expected to agree, and the tone in which he speaks of the authorities in the Church in the early part of the sixteenth century, will, to many of our readers, seem harsh and unjust; but having travelled over much of the same ground, we are compelled to add, that had the plan of his work forced him to deeper research into the state of society, lay and clerical, at the accession of Henry the Eighth, his language would have been more unmeasured; and he would have been called upon to draw such a picture of the fearful corruption of society, as to justify every strong word, and to account for every burst of honest indignation.

The period, indeed, which Mr. Froude has chosen for illustration is one which will always be of painful and absorbing interest. It is a time fruitful in lessons for all ages, and full of warnings to the Church, of what must ensue when zeal has given place to lukewarmness, and indifference has settled down into noisome and seething corruption. Pedants fondly rush to the closing years of the Middle Ages to fortify themselves with precedents: they who are wise will desire to know the whole story of this period, because of the importance and the vitality of principles. By the one it will be hastily regarded as the time of the triumph of man's petulance; others, who look deeper and more reverently into the history of the world, will search in it for the outward and visible signs of those sins for which God punished, and still will punish, a slumbering and a corrupt Church. To attribute the events of history to trifling and accidental causes alone, arises from the same infidelity of heart which assigns the origin of the world to the fortuitous concurrence of atoms.

But though the state of the Church, and the changes which rightly or wrongly then took place, will always naturally possess the chief interest, since the life of a people depends upon the depth of its religious instincts and the fidelity of the national conscience, it has been too much the fashion to regard this period solely as one of ecclesiastical revolution, to consider it with the temper of theological partisans, and to work out a picture in accordance with preconceived theories. Historians have overlooked the social state of the kingdom at large; or, touching upon it with reluctance, have turned to more exciting themes, and hurried to more interesting subjects—the sins and mistakes, the virtues and the vices, with which times of revolution usually abound.

The battle of Bosworth Field at once brought to an end the

worn-out dynasty of the Plantagenets, and the long wars which had, with other causes, led to so fatal an effect in destroying the moral character of the English people. The task which was allotted to the family then called to the throne, was little short of an entire reconstruction of political society. How deeply the very instincts of that society had been corrupted, may yet be learnt, and remains still to be written. This is, to our mind, more important than even the purely ecclesiastical one of the autocracy of the Roman pontiff. It was an incident in the rebuilding of the decayed framework of the nation that this autocracy was rejected. But it is a manifest injury to allow an episode to absorb the whole interest which the great drama itself demands. In endeavouring, then, to ascertain from the testimony of cotemporaries, what was really the aspect of society, and with it the state of the body politic, lay and ecclesiastical, at the close of the fifteenth century, we have no intention of referring to any polemical question. So far as we are concerned at this moment, the benefit or the sin of the Reformation may be all that its opponents or its advocates assert. The necessity or the recklessness of the change, we shall neither grant nor deny. It is our wish merely to review the condition of the people of this country in times immediately preceding the Reformation, and to endeavour to ascertain how institutions which were calculated to hold the affections of men with a firm grasp could have fallen almost without a murmur—certainly without a serious struggle to maintain them.

The difficulty of attaining a full and clear view of the state of English society in the latter half of the fifteenth, and the first quarter of the sixteenth century, arises from that singular dearth both of chronicles and official records which has been regretted by every writer on the history of the period. From the time of Stephen until the middle of the reign of Henry the Sixth, we have a series of annalists, leaving us little to desire. After this period, however, by some strange fatality, we are left with but scanty assistance from either cotemporary history or authoritative document. Thus, the border land between the Middle Ages and modern times is one of obscurity. Whether, with Sir James Macintosh, we imagine this to arise from a decline in the use of the Latin language, and a disinclination for a time to employ the vernacular tongue in the service of historical literature,¹ or whether we believe that the recent invention of the printing-press discouraged the multiplication of manuscript copies of new books, and, at the same time, was too much employed on old and favourite authors to concern itself with its

¹ History of England, vol. II. p. 17.

own times,¹ certain it is that this period is the darkest, and its events the most debatable, in English history.

This failure of the historian's usual materials has added to the temptations which the writers of cabinet pictures of history fall into of regarding even great and germinant events as isolated facts, and so neglecting to trace the sources of even important national movements beyond the more immediate and often trivial accidents of the day; as though the broad current of history could be drawn off into artificial lakes, and analysed and treated of apart from the one ceaseless, ever-flowing tide of events. History, to borrow the appropriate illustration of a modern writer, may have its *reaches*, and it may be convenient to concentrate the attention on some small portion of the river of time, but it is impossible really to detach any one decade or century from the past or the future. If the simplest deeds of an individual survive for ever in their influence upon his life and character, the actions of a State, at any one moment, have as permanent an influence upon the future life and history of the nation.

So long as Church and State are exactly co-extensive, any inquiry into the moral condition of a people must necessarily have chief reference to the Church, which is the great moral agent: not its aspect only in the cloister, and its actions in the synod, but its effects on the face of society, and its influence in restraining the corruption of man's nature. At the period of which Mr. Froude is writing, outwardly the English Church stood in the same position it had filled for some centuries. There was the same hierarchy: two archbishops, both legates, and one a cardinal; bishops as numerous as in the Conqueror's time; abbots and priors, with the same gorgeous state, and more refinement than in the days of the Plantagenets; secular priests, rectors, curates, and mortuary chaplains, monks of all orders, and, where all these failed, mendicant friars. The whole framework of the Church, to a casual observer, seemed as compact and weather-proof as ever. The king was no mean theologian, and had entered the lists, the champion of Rome, withal 'he was very religious, heard three masses daily when he hunted, and sometimes five on other days; and heard the office every day in the queen's chamber, that is to say, vespers and compline.'² All this time the bulk of the nation was rigidly orthodox, and few sights, on the whole, gave greater satisfaction than the punishment of heretics. The laity was a church-

¹ Sir John Fenn, *Preface to Paston Letters*, vol. i. p. viii.

² Giusliniani, *Four Years at the Court of Henry the Eighth*, vol. ii. p. 312.

'The king yesterday deferred to write unto you his letters of his own hands for the saying of his matins in honorem Divæ Virginis; and this day harts and hounds let his grace to do the same.'—*Pace to Wolsey*, *State Papers*, vol. i. p. 51.

going people, and those accustomed to Italian indifference pronounced the English a right religious nation. One of the Venetian ambassadors, writing to the Doge his Relation of England, remarks, that, 'Although they all attend mass every day, and say many paternosters in public (the women carrying long rosaries in their hands, and any who can read taking the Office of our Lady with them, and, with some companion, reciting it in the church verse by verse, in a low voice, after the manner of Churchmen), they always hear mass on Sunday in their parish church, and give liberal alms because they may not offer less than a piece of money, of which fourteen are equivalent to a golden ducat; nor do they omit any form incumbent upon good Christians; there are, however, many who have various opinions concerning religion.' ¹

Though thus seemingly fair, it yet required no great sagacity to know that all this was hollow, and that underneath the smiling surface a very lava flood was bubbling, and threatening, every moment, to destroy all faith, all order—and, what many a man feared more than these, all rights of property, and security of person. Let us stop our ears for awhile to the voices which tell us, by the aid of formal state papers, what the prejudices or the interests of the historian would have us believe.* Let us listen for a time, with Mr. Froude, to the language of Acts of Parliament; but, more than this, let us gather up the secret confessions of men who lived amidst the scandals of those days; the lamentation of honest orthodox piety: the truth, which comes, because unwelcome truth will come, at times, even to the pages of apologists; the records, not of kingdoms, but of police courts, and the pitiable wail of dying testators—and we shall learn why this goodly structure crumbled into dust, and the attachments, and the interests, and the prejudices of centuries fell without a blow, or under one so trivial that it is the bitterest condemnation of any church to attribute so great a change to so marvelously inadequate a cause.

As in the whole of the Western Church, so in England, the traces of ecclesiastical discipline had for some time been difficult to discover; men were reminded of the existence of the Canon law, chiefly by some squabble between the sovereign pontiff and the king, respecting the right to present to a prebendal stall in a cathedral, and by some edifying question, as to whether an Italian youth, or a decayed Secretary of State, had the fitter claim to a bishopric. The Consistory Courts were busy with what ecclesiastical lawyers thought important causes, arising out of the refusal to pay mortuary fees. Convocation had for some

¹ Venetian Relation of England, circ. 1500, p. 23.

time ceased to regard anything beyond the subject of clerical taxation.¹ Bishops, when the pressure of their secular duties permitted, were engaged in ruinous victories over obstinate heretics; but as to moral discipline, or the oversight of manners, and the correction of sin, all that had been long ago given up, and not the faintest shadow of it existed; or it existed, rather, in the shape of a licence for sin, than as the penalty of past guilt. Sir Thomas More tells us that, 'not only the rich, but the poor, also, keep open queans, and live in open adultery, without payment, or penance, or anything almost once said unto them.'² That this is not an over-statement, those who have examined the wills of this period will readily admit. Illegitimate children are as carefully provided for, and as publicly acknowledged, as legitimate offspring.³ The Communion Service in the Book of Common Prayer expresses the lamentation of religious men of *that time*, at the decay of that godly discipline which the Church still prays for, and then first lamented as a thing 'much to be wished.' The profanity of the oaths in general use was appalling. To swear deeply was one of the first lessons of childhood. Sir Thomas Elyot complains: 'We daily hear, to our great heaviness, children swear great oaths, and speak lascivious and unclean words by the example of others, whom they hear, whereat the lewd parents do rejoice.'⁴ From the oaths themselves, we seem to see the necessity of some such teaching as that contained in the first of the Thirty-nine Articles, which declares the true God to be without body, parts, or passions. The last-named writer tells us that, 'in daily communication, the matter savoureth not, except it be, as it were, seasoned with horrible oaths, as by the holy blood of Christ, his wounds, which for our redemption he painfully suffered, his glorious heart, as it were mumbles chopped in pieces. Children (which abhorreth me to remember) do play with the arms and bones of Christ, as they were cherry-stones. The soul of God, which is incomprehensible, and not to be named of any creature without a wonderful reverence and dread, is not only the oath of great gentlemen, but also so indiscretely abused, that they make it (as I might say) their guns, wherewith they thunder out threatenings, and terrible menaces, when they be in their fury, though it be at the damnable play of dice.'⁵ Roger

¹ 'As for my day, as far as I have heard, nor, as I suppose, a good part of my father's neither, they [the clergy] came never together to convocation; but at the request of the king, and at their such assemblies concerning spiritual things, have very little done.'—Sir Thomas More, *English Works*, p. 914.

² *English Works*, p. 249. See also 'Letters on Suppression of the Monasteries,' p. 248.

³ Sir Harris Nicolas in Preface to *Testamenta vetusta*.

⁴ *The Governor*, p. 15 (ed. 1565).

⁵ *The Governor*, p. 161.

Ascham, in similar language, expresses his horror at the universality, the frequency, and the blasphemy of the oaths.¹ On this subject we purposely abstain from quoting the writings of theologians of the period, nor is it necessary; every writer testifies to the same purpose. What Sir Thomas Elyot and others say in nervous prose, Alexander Barclay sings in fluent if not melodious verse:—

‘Some sweareth armes, nails, heart, and body,
Tearing our Lord worse than the Jews him arayed.’²

And again:—

‘If any discord
Among them fall, the wounds of God are sworn,
His arms, heart, and bones almost at every word;
Thus is our Saviour among these catiffs torn.’³

We are only now escaping from this contamination. Whatever some may fancy about a love of truth, and a regard to the sanctity of judicial oaths being English characteristics, the men of that time had escaped from such trammels; falsehood and universal perjury went hand in hand with profanity; and notwithstanding stringent laws, and every possible contrivance to ensure truth-speaking, the writers whom we have already cited, and their cotemporaries, lament that it was almost impossible, either in a court of justice or in private life, to guard against the general untruthfulness, not of the race, but certainly of the race at that time.⁴ This evil had infected all classes. ‘Perjury reigneth everywhere,’⁵ is Tonsall’s testimony. It must have been well-nigh inveterate before Archbishop Wareham could, for this reason, have declined to make a return of the value of the benefices of his peculiars, and recommended that this should be done by the ordinaries ‘wher ther benefices liethe, wher they cannot so wel hied the value of ther benefices, and clooke ther *perjurie*, as they might to me, that knoweth not the value of ther benefices, ne yet can lieghtly come to the knowlege thereof.’⁶ These are not light words lightly spoken. They are not the rhetorical exaggeration of a preacher. They were written by a statesman-archbishop to a minister, who knew well

¹ E. g. Toxophilus, p. 84. Schoolmaster, p. 225. English Works (edit. 1815). ‘Everything that we affirm or deny must have an oath coupled with it. When men do buy or sell anything, more oaths be oftentimes interchanged betwixt them, than pence that the thing is sold for. In communication, and all pastimes, as many oaths as words be used. In playing at any games, there the tearing of God’s name, and particular mention of all the wounds and paines that Christ suffered for us, be contumeliously in vaine brought forth.’—The Bishop of Durham (Cuthbert Tonsall), Sermon before Henry VIII., p. 37.

² Ship of Fools, fol. 34 (edit. 1570).

³ Ib. fol. 149.

⁴ The Governor, p. 161.

⁵ Bishop of Durham, Sermon, p. 37.

⁶ Archbishop Wareham to Wolsey. Ellis, Original Letters, Third Series, vol. ii. p. 34.

how to detect a true statement from a false one, and who was not a man to be trifled with. To Wolsey, the Archbishop dared not have uttered a causeless slander; and this is the character which Warcham gives of the clergy of the province of Canterbury.

The lying and perjury were of no recent date, however much they might have increased of late years. The general untruthfulness showed itself in many ways, and in all classes of society. England, with little trade-competition, was suffering under what we are in the habit of attributing too exclusively to that cause. The staple exports of the kingdom had been injured by the dishonest practices of the manufacturers. The tanner sent his half-tanned leather into the market with the seal of the searcher affixed, vouching it to be well and sufficiently tanned, and, as a consequence, 'the kynge's poore subjects be greatly 'hyndred, and decayde, and fewe of them can go or ride drie, 'either in shoes or bootes, nor have any good or strong horse 'harneis of lether, ne any enduryng sadells, maales"or boud- 'gettes, ne any other thynges made of tanned lether, to ther 'great damage, losse, and hynderaunce, notwithstanding dyvers 'good statutes have been made,'¹ &c. 'The clothier cheated his customers, foreign and domestic, in a similar way. His pack of cloth, when unrolled, was found to have a smaller quantity than it purported to contain. The outer fold was of a finer and better quality than the rest of the roll. Commonly, the maker racked his cloth 'until it was stretched a full third beyond its length, and then thickened the whole with 'flock powder,' made of woollen rags, ground down for that purpose.' Statute after statute, at least as far back as the reign of Richard the Second, had attempted to make tradesmen honest; but, apparently, with no effect. The 'deceitful cloth' of England was still the subject of Acts of Parliament in the reign of Henry the Eighth; and we learn from Latimer the way in which the cheat was effected: 'If his cloth be eighteen yards long, he will set him 'on a rack, and stretch him out with ropes, till the sinews 'shrink again, while he hath brought him to twenty-seven 'yards. When they have brought him to that perfection, they 'have a pretty feat to thicken him again. He makes me a powder 'for it, and plays the poticary; they call it flock powder; they do 'so incorporate it to the cloth, that it is wonderful to consider: 'truly a goodly invention.'² The invention of devil's dust and shoddy was no modern one. An Act of Parliament of Richard the Third tells us that 'the same clothes deceyvably wrought

¹ See e. g. 13 Rich. II. c. 12; 1 Hen. VII. c. 1, and 24 Henry VIII. c. 1.

² Giustiniani's *Four Years at the Court of Henry the Eighth*, vol. ii. pp. 46—293. Statutes 3 Rich. II. c. 2; 7 Rich. II. c. 9; and so *passim* till 27 Hen. VIII. p. 12.

³ Third Sermon before Edward VI

'after they ben fully wette, and shorn ben sett uppon tayntours
'and drawen out in leyngth and brede, that is to say, some of the
'same clothes beyng but of the length of xxiii yerdys ben drawen
'out into length of xxx^{ti} yerdis . . And also the clothmakers . .
'beyng bare of threde usen for to powder and caste flokkys of
'fynner clóth uppon course clothes to thentent to make the same
'clothe to appere fyne and good.'¹ Thus it passed into the hand
of the foreign merchant and of the retail dealer. The latter in
selling it to his customers had his own vulgar method of
cheating. The apprentice in *Piers Plowman* informs us,—

'First I lerned to lye,
A leef outhur tweyne;
Wikkedly to weyc
Was my firste lesson.'²

His donet, or grammar lesson, was how to draw the yard
measure over the cloth so as to defraud the buyer of an inch in
a yard. But particular instances afford a slender idea of the
depravity of trade at this moment. During the whole reign
of Henry the Seventh, the statutes of the realm give sad evidence
of national dishonesty. If we except what we may properly call
private Acts of Parliament, such as bills of attainder, and the
reversal of former attainders, scarcely anything remains except
acts against fraudulent cloth-workers, tanners, fustian-weavers,
upholsterers, embroiderers, coiners, forgers, poachers, perjurers,
usurers, convicts who had escaped hanging by pleading the
benefit of clergy—the ticket-of-leave men of that day. In short,
almost every trade and calling is declared by the statutes of this
reign to be conducted dishonestly. London—Catholic London
—with the population of one of our county towns, and a large
staff of clergy, possessed no advantage in point of trade, or other
morality, over that over-grown mass, which, at the present time,
we call by the same name. The moral features were the same.
Making allowance for its enormous growth since those days,
there was far more social crime, far more sin, far more distress.
The card-sharpers and swindlers of that time were as dexterous
as those of our own; the retail dealer and chapman, at least as
unscrupulous as now; the adulteration of food as common.
In the streets, the Irish costermonger³ used precisely the same
arts of deception which the English costermonger does now;
and there were the same showily-dressed and importunate fallen

¹ 1 Rich. III. c. 8.

² Vision of *Piers Plowman*, lines 2877—2880, Wright's Edition.

³ 'All costermongers are Irishmen, and all your chimney-sweepers likewise.'
Dekker, Old Plays, vol. iii. p. 330. So Skelton, in '*Spekeparrot*' (*Works*, vol. ii.
p. 5, line 87), mimicking the Irish dialect:—

' "Moryshe myne owne shelve," the costermonger sayth;
Fate, fate, fate, ye Irish waterlag.'

ones. In short, every social evil, every moral pollution which we deplore, we have received, as a fatal heritage, from ante-Reformation times.

The fountains of public and private morality were fast breaking up. A general deluge of licentiousness, and profanity, and perjury had spread itself on all sides. And the alarmed guardians of public safety tried, since religion seemed wholly to have failed them, to reach security by the stern teaching of the axe and the rope. At the accession of Henry the Eighth, society in this country had almost reached the point at which society ceases to exist. We have, hitherto, chiefly spoken of immoralities, which indicate the corruption of the conscience, and the lack of spiritual discipline, which should have corrected the evil. But, beyond this, crimes punishable by the state were so general, that the ordinary prisons were insufficient for the number of criminals, and the hangman's office had lost much of its terror, from the frequency of executions. Hollingshed asserts that seventy-two thousand thieves were hung during the reign of Henry the Eighth,¹ a period of thirty-eight years. Here we see at once the prevalence of ordinary crimes, and the uselessness of attempting their cure by the existing modes of punishment. It was society itself that had become corrupt. The controversialist is ready enough to attribute this to the suppression of the monasteries. This, however, is the plea of ignorance. In the preceding reign, matters were still worse; and we are told by one not likely to exaggerate on this subject, that 'thieves were then hanged so fast that there were sometimes 'twenty on one gibbet; and one could not wonder enough how 'it came to pass that since so few escaped, there were yet so 'many thieves left, who were still robbing in all places.'²

This is the testimony of an Englishman, whose office specially fitted him to be a witness; others tell us the same. 'There is 'no country in the world,' says the Venetian ambassador, 'where there are so many thieves and robbers as in England; 'insomuch, that few venture to go alone in the country, excepting 'in the middle of the day; and fewer still in the towns at 'night; and least of all, in London... People are taken up 'every day by dozens, like birds in a covey, and especially in 'London; yet, for all this, they never cease to rob and murder 'in the streets.'³ As to London 'there was, every week, some 'executed in one place of the city or other; for there were three 'weeks' sessions at Newgate, and fortnight sessions at the 'Marshalsea, and so forth.'⁴ But, however prevalent crime

¹ Hollingshed, *Chronicles*, vol. i. p. 314, edit. 1807.

² Sir Thomas More. *The Utopia*, Book I.

³ Venetian Relation of England, about 1500.

⁴ Latimer's Sermons.

might be in the capital, it was little less so elsewhere. 'Behold,' exclaims Sir Thomas Elyot, 'what an infinite number of English men and women at this present time wander in all places throughout this realm, as beasts, brute and savage, abandoning all occupation, service, and honesty.' How many seemly personages by outrage in riot, gaming, and excess of apparel, be induced to thefts and robbery, and, sometimes, to murder: to the inquietation of good men; and, finally, to their own destruction.'¹

When it is remembered that at this time, and until the twenty-third year of the reign of Henry the Eighth (1531), criminals convicted of murder, arson, and other offences, had the punishment of death commuted if they were 'lettered,' and so entitled to the benefit of clergy; and, therefore, that this frightful number of executions was of illiterate persons only, some idea may be formed of the quantity of great offenders, and the insecurity of life and property.²

Such general depravity might seem to justify any measures of repression. When ordinary means have confessedly failed, no one can, in reason, object to extraordinary ones. Amongst others who bewailed the all but universal corruption of the nation, the Earl of Surrey is remarkable for what appears a whimsical attempt at reformation. On the 1st of April, 1543, he and two others were 'called before the Council, charged with walking about the streets of London during the night time, breaking the windows of the houses with stones, shot from cross-bows.' His companions 'at first denied all knowledge of the breaking of windows; but Lord Surrey admitted that he had done so, beseeching the council not to impute the offence to levity, and protesting that his motive was a religious one. "Observing the corrupt and licentious manners of the citizens, and that the remonstrances of their spiritual pastors had been urged in vain, I went," he exclaimed, "at midnight, through the streets, and shot from my cross-bow at their windows, that the stones passing noiselessly through the air, and breaking in suddenly upon their guilty secrecy, might remind them of the suddenness of that punishment which the Scriptures tell us

¹ The Governor, p. 171.

² Formerly, 'benefit of clergy' might be pleaded by any lettered layman, however often he was convicted; this privilege was curtailed by an Act of Parliament of Henry the Seventh:—'Item,—Whereas upon trust of privilege of the Church, diverse persons lettered hath been the more bold to commit murder, rape, robbery, theft, and all other mischievous deeds, because they have been continually admitted to the benefit of the Clergy as oft as they did offend in any of the premises: In avoiding of such presumptuous boldness, it is enacted, ordained, and stablished by the authority of this present Parliament, that every person not being within orders which once hath been admitted to the benefit of his Clergy afterwards arraigned of any such offence, be not admitted to have the benefit of his clergy, &c.'—4 Hen. VII. c. 12.

‘Divine justice will inflict on impenitent sinners, and so lead them to reformation.’”¹

The untrodden wastes of Africa, and the pathless steppes of Tartary, have, at different times, been imagined to be the realm of Prester John. The same fancy has assigned the close of the fifteenth century as the true time when England was indeed ‘Merrie England.’ We have been of late years invited to consider all time before the religious cataclysm of the sixteenth century as the ‘Ages of Faith.’ We have no wish needlessly to dispel the dreams of pleasant romance; but we are unable to discover the causes of joy, or to see the signs of anything, save that wild mirth which breaks at times from the mob around the gallows, or the mirth, half madness, if not wholly licentious, which the great Italian novelist has marked as one of the characteristics of the plague-time at Florence. Happily for England, the race of the Plantagenets, which had degenerated into a Richard the Second, and had fallen to a shadow in Henry the Sixth, had been swept away; and Providence—whose mercies faith will always acknowledge, and the eye may sometimes see—had placed at this time in the seat of power a family, beyond all others fitted to grapple with the sins and the corruption of the times. Stern and rough were the Tudor methods of government; but theirs was a true government, and under it the people of this country were dragged out of the slough of despond into which they had fallen, and shook off much of the mire which had gathered on their garments in the passage.

Whilst the whole of the documentary evidence of these times leads us to but one conclusion as to the condition of the laity of this country, who formed the great bulk of the Catholic Church, polemical historians have painted the ecclesiastics in colours as varied as their own prepossessions. In history, as in other matters, ‘the eye sees what the eye brings means of seeing,’ and narrative writers have a wonderful facility in overlooking facts which are inconsistent with their own theories. So long, indeed, as ‘State Papers’ are the chief authorities, it is comparatively an easy task to make the history of a people shape itself to any conclusion that may be required. All that is needed is an hypothesis, selected facts, and dexterity in the use of the subjunctive and potential moods.

Whoever will honestly examine the materials which yet remain to us, will, we believe, come to the same conclusion as to the state of the Church, which men of such different opinions and cast of mind as the late Mr. Pugin and Mr. Froude have arrived at. When speaking of the dissolution of the monasteries, the latter writer says: ‘If the extracts which I have made lead

¹ *Archæologia*, vol. xxv. Surrey’s Poems, p. 69, ed. 1831.

' persons disposed to differ with me to examine the documents which are extant upon the subject, they will learn what I have concealed as well as what I have alleged; and I believe that, if they begin the inquiry (as I began it myself) with believing that the poor monks have been over-hardly judged, they will close it with but one desire—that the subject shall never more be mentioned.'¹ And Mr. Pugin, glancing at the state of the whole Church in this country at this period, tells us what the result of such an investigation was, as to his own mind: 'Let us examine the ordinary Catholic idea that prevails among our own body... All anterior to the Reformation is regarded and described as a sort of Utopia,—pleasant meadows, happy peasants, merry England, . . . Such charity, and such hospitality, and such unity, when every man was a Catholic. I once believed in this Utopia myself; but when tested by stern facts and history, it all melts away like a dream.'² It does, indeed, *all* melt away; and after the first view has dissolved, a very different picture will appear on the canvas.

The effort to make a 'council of perfection' the rule for a whole class, was, in the nature of things, likely to be attended with failure. The attempt to enforce the celibacy of the clergy gave rise to continued resistance, and called out the perverted ingenuity, or encouraged vice in an order of men who were required to be examples of honesty and of chastity. At first, the law of celibacy was evaded in a way which threatened to extinguish the entire order of the priesthood. Beneficed clerks were content with the first tonsure, and declined to advance beyond the minor or 'unsacred orders.' During the fourteenth century, it would seem that half the number of rectories throughout England were held by acolytes, unable to administer the Sacrament of the Altar, to hear confessions, or even to baptize. Presented to a benefice often before of age to be ordained, the rector preferred to marry, and to remain a layman, or, at best, a clerk in minor orders. The choice of the patron of a living was, indeed, in nowise limited to clerks, provided he did not present an Israelite; any other layman was considered eligible; with regard to tonsured persons, the single class prohibited from holding a benefice, was that of the friars. '*Exceptis judeis et viris religiosis*,' are the general words occurring in the deed of sale of an advowson. This latter exception, however, was not such as to prevent a friar having the temporary charge of souls. In short, during the time to which we refer, rectories were looked upon and treated as lay-fees. Benefices under the value of five marks

¹ History of England, chap. x. vol. ii. p. 429.

² Earnest Address on the Establishment of the Hierarchy, p. 13.

could, according to the canons, be held only by clerks ministering in person; but if above that value, they might legally be held in plurality, or *in commendam*, sometimes by priests, at other times by clerks in minor orders, by laymen, and even by children.

Synod after Synod, and Archbishop after Archbishop, laboured in part to correct this evil. It could not be permitted by the rule of the Church that the Rector should remain an acolyte. Under ordinary circumstances, he must advance to the priesthood. In fact, this latter was the only order, save the episcopal one, which was at all a reality. In the fifteenth century, men usually passed within three or four months, through the orders of acolyte, sub-deacon, deacon, and priest. It is rare to find instances of persons who suffered the interval of a twelvemonth to elapse, between receiving the lower and superior order. A maxim of the ecclesiastical law of that time shows the laxity of discipline. All that was thought necessary was that the clerk should officiate once in each of the grades of the ministry. But even this was wholly set aside with reference to the lower orders, and the young neophyte was usually ordained on the same day acolyte and sub-deacon. Even this was too stringent a rule to be at all times enforced; and just before the Reformation we meet with large and important benefices with cure of souls, and ecclesiastical dignities, held by laymen. Poggio, for instance, was not thought disqualified for holding a benefice in this country to which he was presented by the Bishop of Winchester, though he was ignorant of the language, a layman, and, moreover, 'had great objections to the clerical life.'¹ Colet² was rector of the large living of Dennington at the age of nineteen, and held this and several other benefices before he had received the first tonsure; and Reginald Pole³ was not only Dean of Exeter, but sat and voted in the Convocation of the Clergy for eighteen years before his ordination.⁴ Whatever casual aid might be given by any of the itinerant friars, or by

¹ Shepherd's Life of Poggio, p. 124. (Second Edition.)

² Knight's Life of Colet, p. 20. (First Edition.)

³ Philip's Life of Pole, vol. i. pp. 6, 159. (Second Edition.)

⁴ Roger Ascham, when offered a prebendal stall, very honourably declined to be benefited by such a common but yet sacrilegious perversion of the goods of the Church. 'Mr. Petre said he would and the means the Queen's majesty' [Mary] 'should bestow such prebends on me as I should be well able to live. Mine answer was, seeing my service shall be in civil jurisdiction, and not in ecclesiastical, and seeing prebends were rewards for the one life and not for the other, surely I would not crave the profit where I should not do the duty; and as I would not be busy to condemn other men that took them, so would I not be greedy in this kind of life to receive them; but had rather live by duty, under order in my poor estate, than with catching of both sides enrich myself with disorder.'—See Ascham to Gardiner, in Whitaker's *Richmondshire*, i. 272; and to Mr. Secretary Petre, in Report of Cambridge Antiquarian Society, 1854.

the chantry priests of the parish, who, however, held themselves exonerated from the cure of souls,¹ pastoral care must in such parishes have been unknown, ecclesiastical discipline impossible, and even ordinary clerical ministrations at all times uncertain, and often wholly wanting.

Whilst so many benefices were thus held, frequent complaints were made both of the number and the mean condition of the priests,—evils which, in the laxity of discipline, or rather the absence of all discipline, were difficult to be guarded against. In the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries the territorial jurisdiction of a bishop had, in fact, come to be uncircumscribed. Suffragans, and even foreign prelates on their travels, granted indulgences to a shrine, or abbey, or a church, and conferred orders sometimes without reference to the bishop of the diocese. This abuse was encouraged by the confusion of the times, and was sometimes almost necessary from the absence of the proper Bishop: its effects, however, in swelling the ranks of the priesthood, was at best occasional and local. A permanent and almost universal cause was the increase of income, which might be derived from the fees received at ordination—a practice, though denounced by repeated canons and injunctions, unremedied before the Council of Trent. These priests, ordained without titles, or upon those that were fraudulent and fictitious, added largely to the disrepute into which the whole clerical body had sunk. Clemangis speaks of the ‘enormous multitude of base and worthless priests’² throughout Europe; and that this was literally true in this country so late as the beginning of the sixteenth century, we learn from Sir Thomas More, who draws the following picture of the English priesthood:—‘The time was, I say, when few men durst presume to take upon them the high office of a priest; not even when they were chosen and called thereunto. Now runneth every rascal, and boldly offereth himself for able. And where the dignity passeth all princes and they that lewd be desireth it for worldly winning; yet cometh that sort thereto with such a mad mind that they reckon almost God himself much bounden to them that they vouchsafe to take it. But were I Pope, I could not well devise better provisions than are by the Church provided already, if they were as well kept as they be well made. But for the number I would surely see such a way therein that we should not have such a rabel that every mean man must have a priest in his house to wait upon his wife, which no man almost lacketh now, to the contempt of the priesthood in as vile office as his horsekeeper.’³

¹ Johnson's Canons, vol. ii. p. 421, Ang. Cath. lib. edit.

² ‘Illa copiosa vilium atque indignissimorum presbyterorum multitudo.’—De Corrupt. Eccles. Statu. c. xvi.

³ Dialogue on Heresies, book iii. chap. 12. . Eng. Works, 227, 228.

To this we may add some touches which Ascham has preserved, and which are in keeping, even if they extend the sketch given us by More:—"If a man, now-a-days, have two sons, the one impotent, weak, sickly, lisping, stuttering, and stammering, and having any misshape in his body, what doth the father of such an one commonly say? This boy is fit for nothing else but to set to learning, and make a priest of; as who would say, the outcast of the world, having neither countenance, tongue, nor wit (for of a perverse body cometh commonly a perverse mind), be good enough to make those men of, which shall be appointed to preach God's Holy Word and minister his blessed Sacrament, besides other most weighty matters in the commonwealth."

This is not a random assertion. However incredible at first sight such an utter disregard of ecclesiastical discipline may appear, the complaint which Roger Ascham here makes had been made thirty years before by Alexander Barclay, 'priest and chaplain in the College of S. Mary Ottery.' In the section on 'the abusion of the spiritualitie,' he says:—

'If he be
Misshapen of his face, his hands, or his feet,
And for no business worldly profitable,
For the holy Church then think they him most meet.'

Of this crowd of priests many were settled as chaplains in the houses of the nobility and gentry, and held there a dubious position. Where many servants were kept, as in the households of the greater barons, the chaplain held the fifth or sixth place amongst the servants. His wages and livery were apportioned to him with the other servants, and he was required to take his share in the menial work. He accompanied his patron's children to school, was employed to deliver messages, and especially letters. Even in the family of the princely Earl of Northumberland, amidst his affectation of regal state, the Dean of his Chapel sat at dinner at the table of the chamberwomen and ushers; and though in this instance he was required to have graduated as bachelor of divinity, besides presiding in the chapel, he kept account of the entry of provisions into the kitchen.¹ Abroad it was difficult to distinguish the chaplain priest, either by dress or occupation, from the rest of the people. Whatever Canonists

¹ *Toxophilus*. The condition of the English Church was not an exceptional one. In this respect it resembled that of every other country in the Roman obedience. In the heads of reformation submitted to Paul III. by the Council of Cardinals, we are told that 'Nowhere is any care or diligence shown in the ordination of clerks; whoever offers himself, however ignorant, mean in condition, or vicious in life, though he may be a boy, yet is he admitted to the priesthood, to the scandal and contempt of Holy Orders.'

² *Ship of Fools*, fol. 144.

³ *Northumberland Household Book*.

and Synods might determine, he bore his bow and quiver like any yeoman, carried his knife in his girdle, and slew his man when necessary without any stain upon his priestly character.¹ Even the public lists at Smithfield sometimes witnessed a clerical duellist, and the only favour granted him over his lay opponent was time and opportunity to be instructed in the use of arms, should he be proved inexpert.² In addition to the chaplain, priests were to be met with filling various domestic offices in all large households. Wolsey had a steward who was always a priest. Cardinal Bainbridge was poisoned by a priest who held a menial office in his establishment. Nor was this any peculiarity of churchmen; the same arrangement is met with in the household rolls of wealthy laymen, in defiance or ignorance of the Canons, which directed that 'beneficed Clergymen, or clerks 'in holy orders, be not stewards of farms, bailiffs, or seneschals, 'and so bound to give account to laymen.'³ Account they did render in many capacities. In the farm and the kitchen, the meanest offices were often undertaken by priests, who obtained their present livelihood and acquired a claim for future clerical preferments by the assiduity with which they performed their secular duties. In the household accounts of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, reference to priests occurs in connexion with the most undignified and degrading occupations. 'Given to the friar that brought beer to my master, viij.' 'Paid to the priest,' as we learn shortly after, 'the French priest, the 'pheasant breeder at Eltham, for to buy him a gown and other 'necessaries, 40s.'⁴ 'To the priest that wrestled at Cirencester, 'vi. viij. ;'⁵ and such like items are to be met with in the family accounts of this period. In the "Plumpton Correspondence" we have a plaintive letter of one who tells us that he is 'a good preacher,' and at the same time complaining that he has 'no living but his buying and selling.' Clemangis declares that the swarm of priests who at Rome were waiting the chance of

¹ Depositions in Ecclesiastical Cases. Surtees' Society, Pub. p. 14. Barclay's Ship of Fools,—Of ~~gewe~~ fassions and disguised garmentes, fol. 9.

² Proceedings of Privy Council, vol. vi. p. 57. &c. Chronicle of London, p. 90. English Chronicle, p. 34. In such cases there appeared a desire to prevent either of the combatants being subject to a disadvantage from inferior skill or strength. In the reign of Henry IV., 'a woman accused a Grey-friar of Cambridge, an old man, of certain words that he should have said against the king, and his judgment was, that he should fight with the woman and his one hand bound behind him: but the Archbishop of Canterbury was the friar's friend, and ceased the matter.'—Ib. p. 23.

³ Archbishop Langton's Constitutions, A.D. 1222; see Johnson's Canons, vol. ii. p. 106.

⁴ Household Book of Sir John Howard, edit. Beriah Botfield.—1463.

⁵ Privy purse expenses of Henry VIII. Ed. Nicolas, 1532.

⁶ Privy purse expenses of Henry VII. 'Excerpta Historica,' 1496.

⁷ P. 41.

benefices which the Pope claimed the power of conferring, were drawn, 'not from the study or the school, but from the plough and the shopboard.'¹ In keeping with this assertion, after the beautiful delineation which Chaucer has left us of the 'poor parson of a town,'—he adds:—

'With him there was a ploughman, his brother.'

And Dame Margaret Paston, anxious to provide for the child of one of her servants, is unable to decide whether she shall make him a priest or a ploughman. In either station he was equally respected, and equally subservient. The livery, which in common with the carter and the hind he received from his patron, was carried by him into the House of God. There, as regularly as the serving man bore his lord's cognisance on his sleeve, the priest's vestments were brodered with the same emblems of vanity and submission. The processional cope, azure and gold, and blazoned with fess, chevron, and lions rampant,² mingled incongruously, but significantly, with the unearthly symbols of man's redemption. So again within the Church the same tokens of worldliness were obtruded. Although no scrupulous conscience was wounded by an ordinance enjoining the placing of the Royal Arms over the chancel-arch, the windows and walls were gay with the shields of the knightly or lordly families in the vicinity; and whatever might be the party prejudice of the worshipper, he bowed before an altar resplendent with the last triumph of faction,—the red rose and daisy of Dame Margaret of Richmond, or the sacred monogram surmounted by the portcullis of the House of Lancaster.³ If he approached to receive the Body of his Lord, in the magnificence around him, he was reminded of the willing subjection of the spouse of Christ to 'the pomps and vanity of this wicked world.' Around the neck of the celebrant hung the stole, the symbol of the spiritual yoke of Christ, embroidered, it might be, with the cross, but certainly countercharged with the arms of the patron or donor. With many a fervent aspiration for mediæval glories, and a lament at the disuse of such earthly gauds,

¹ De Corrupt. Eccles. Statu.

² Every inventory of the goods of a church will illustrate this:—

e.g. 'Cope venise gold, with Lord Monteagle's arms.

Another of cloth of gold with the said Lord Monteagle's arms.

Another with the said earl's coronet.'

Coucher-book of Whalley, (23 Hen. VIII.) vol. iv.

³ Amongst the goods given by Bishop Fisher to S. John's College, Cambridge, was,—

'First, a suit of vestments of red cloth of gold with spangles and crosses, in the midst embroidered with Jesus Christ and portcullis.

'Item, a vestment of green velvet, embroidered with red roses, with a cross of gold of stole work wrought with daisies.'—*Lewis's Life of Bishop Fisher*, in Appendix, vol. ii. p. 297.

Dr. Rock especially instances two stoles, superb specimens of worldliness, which have been handed down with religious care and veneration. The one bearing the solemn suffrage in the Litany, '*In hora mortis succurre nobis Domine,*' worked in large letters all down it; each letter of the inscription being in the centre of a quatrefoil on a gold ground; at each end a shield displaying *or a cross sable*; and in the middle of its length the arms of Lacy, Earl of Lincoln, *or a lion rampant purple*. The other stole, 'ten feet long by two inches in breadth, and ornamented with no less than thirty-eight shields of arms on a ground alternately green and pink, worked in silk and gold. . . from the heraldry of its bearings it would seem to be of the date of Henry the Sixth.'¹ Few churches but possessed some such heraldic vestments; for if the sinner on his death-bed, clothing himself for his last struggle in the cloak of S. Francis, or S. Dominic, bequeathed in return his own best robe to the altar of the neighbouring church, he fettered the gift with the condition that it should for ever after bear the arms of the giver.²

From the evils of pluralities we are only now entirely escaping. This is, however, an evil which has been gradually diminishing. The scandal of the last century was but a faint shadow of that of earlier days. Before the Reformation it had reached to such a pitch, that men whose fidelity to Rome is unquestioned, and whose knowledge of the actual state of the Church cannot be doubted, tell us of Cardinals who were at one and the same time monks and canons, regulars and seculars, holding every office, however seemingly incompatible, and possessing not ten or twenty, but sometimes the incredible number of from four to five hundred benefices, and these not the poorest, but the wealthiest, and the largest parishes.³ In this country

¹ Church of our Fathers, vol. i. p. 412. So completely had this deference to secular dignity and power become the normal condition of the Church in the Middle Ages, that it is almost impossible to separate it even in thought from the history or the art of the fifteenth century. We may see ludicrous instances of this in the works of a great modern architect. Mr. Pugin had succeeded in imbibing the very spirit of the age whose glories he laboured to restore. Hence he sometimes imitated, even with an almost Chinese exactness, the symbolism which proclaimed this very undignified and irreverent alliance between the Church and the world. At this day the worshipper in his magnificent church at Cheadle passes into the house of God through doors covered with the Lion rampant of its patron; and whatever thought of devotion the Calvary Cross at Alton is capable of calling up is instantly checked, when midway on the shaft of that Cross, which is surmounted by shields bearing the emblems of the awful passion of our blessed Lord, the eye is forced to rest painfully upon the four shields, which occupy the place of honour, each covered with the lion of the Talbots.

² Wills of the period, *passim*.

³ Clemangis, De Corrupt. Ecc. Statu. cap. xi.—'Quæ utique abominatio, quod unus tenet ducenta, alter trecenta beneficia ecclesiastica? Nonne inde divinus

the statutes of provisors had put some check upon this abuse; our pluralists were forced to rest contented with a more moderate number of cures of souls; but even here instances of twenty and thirty parishes, cures in almost every diocese, and benefices in England, Ireland, and Wales, held by one man, were too customary to be considered exceptional.¹ Provincial Synods and several Archbishops by their injunctions had attempted a reformation in this matter; but the ease with which dispensations were obtained at Rome frustrated every attempt at amendment. No language can well be more direct than that embodied in the local canons; but so long as appeals to Rome were allowed, the scandal remained without chance of abatement. If, however, the grievous injury inflicted upon the Church by the accumulation of benefices, were in some degree checked by the laws of the country, the evils of non-residence continued to be a constant source of irritation. What it was two hundred years before it continued to be at the beginning of the sixteenth century.

In Chaucer's prologue to the *Canterbury Tales*, amongst the virtues of his parson, he instances that,—

- 'He set not his benefice to hire,
And let his shepe accomber in the mire,
And renne to London to saint Poules,
To seken him a chauntrie for soules:
Or with a brotherhode to be withold,
But dwelt at home and kept well his fold.'

It was a fertile subject of complaint from the fourteenth to the sixteenth century, that the parson, if in priest's orders, deserted his proper charge to gain an increase to his living by mortuary masses, annals, trentals, masses of requiem, and such like. The usual fee for such masses varied from threepence to eightpence; and, notwithstanding the attempts by repeated canons to make them a less tempting employment, the sums that could be easily obtained from this source led the Clergy to abandon the more laborious work of the pastorate. The popular poet of the fourteenth century preserves the common complaint that,—

'Parsons and parisshe preestes
Pleynd hem to the bisshope,
That hire parissches weren povere
Sith the pestilence tyme,
To have a licence and leve
At London to dwelle
And syngen ther for symonie,
For silver is swete.

cultus diminuitur, ecclesie depauperantur, valentibus viris et doctoribus privantia fidelibus mala exempla dantur.—*Henricus de Langenstein apud Von der Hardt, Conc. Const. t. ii. pt. I, p. 52.*

¹ *Gibson's Codex, p. 946, note. (1st edit.)*

Bisshopes and bachelers,
Bothe maistres and doctours,
That han cure under Crist,
And crownynge in tokene
And signe that thei sholden
Shryven hire parissheens,
Prechen and praye for hem,
'And the povere fede,
Liggen at Londone
In Lenten and ellis.

Somme serven the kyng,
And his silver tellen
In cheker and in chauncelrie,
Chalangen hise dettes
Of wardes and of wardemotes,
Weyves and sheyves.

And some serven as servauntz
Lordes and ladies,
And in stede of stywardes
Sitten and demen.¹

Thus sings the poet of the people. But the picture he draws owes nothing to the power of imagination, and derives no colour from satire. It is plain, unadorned truth. It falls very far short, indeed, of the language which Archbishop Islip uses on the same subject:—‘We are certainly informed by common fame and experience that modern priests, through covetousness and love of ease, not content with reasonable salaries, demand excessive pay for their labours, and receive it; and do so despise labour, and study pleasure, that they wholly refuse, as parish priests, to serve in churches or chapels, or to attend the cure of souls, though fitting salaries are offered them, that they may live in a leisurely manner by celebrating annals for the quick and dead; and so parish churches and chapels remain unofficiated, destitute of parochial chaplains, and even proper curates, to the grievous danger of souls; and the said priests, pampered with excessive salaries, discharge their intemperance in vomit and lust, grow wild, and drown themselves in the abyss of vice, to the great scandal of ecclesiastics and the evil example of laymen. We, therefore, desiring a quick cure of this plague, do, with the advice and consent of our brethren, enact and ordain that all beneficed chaplains, especially such as are qualified for parochial churches and chapels and the cure of souls, be bound to officiate and attend them at the moderate salaries mentioned below.’²

The income gained from such sources was large, though uncertain; and, of course, fluctuating. When masses for the

¹ ‘Piers Plowman, 185—191.’

² Archbishop Islip’s Constitutions. Johnson’s Canons, vol. ii. pp. 421, 422.

dead were directed by will to be said in numbers varying from a thousand to ten thousand. and that 'with all speed,' 'in all possible haste after my decease,' 'in all the haste that may be goodly,' 'as soon as notice may come of my death,' or 'immediately after my death, on the following day, if possible; or the second or third at the farthest,'¹ they furnished occupation for a large number of priests; who, when not so occupied, according to other testimony besides that of Islip, led an idle, and, too often, a dissolute life. Every attempt at abating the scandal utterly failed. When the sixteenth century opened, the wound of at least two hundred years was yet unhealed; still 'the order is rebuked by the priests' begging and lewd living, 'which either is fain to walk at rovers and live upon trentals, or worse, or else to serve in a secular man's house.'² The law of the English Church was sufficiently explicit, but the readiness with which dispensations could be obtained made the law useless. The appeal was always to the canon, yet still the corruption of practice went on unchecked. 'Let the laws be rehersed that command personal residence of curates in their churches. For of this many evils grow, because all things now-a-days are done by vicars and parish priests;' ye and these foolish also, and unmeet; and often times wicked; that seek none other thing in the people than foul lucre, whereof cometh occasion of evil heresies and ill Christendom in the people.'⁴ Scarcely a synod but complained of this practice; yet the evil was too inveterate for cure. Men who were indignant enough when looking at it as an abstract question, complacently followed the crowd, and walked in the tradition of Western Europe when the matter presented itself as one of personal wealth and personal influence. In 1537, Pole was one of four cardinals who declared it to be an abuse which they 'deemed of great moment to the Church of God' that cardinals should be also holders of bishoprics, 'because the office of a cardinal is incompatible with the Episcopate.'⁵ His biographer indeed claims for him the chief or entire merit of the suggestion. Yet, but a few years after, he himself did that which he here considers of so great injury to the Church, and accepted the see of Canterbury.

But any inquiry into the state of the Church, either with regard to her lay or clerical members, would be incomplete if we omitted all reference to the morals of the clergy. History

¹ *Testamenta Vetusta, passim.*

² Sir Thos. More, *Dial. on Heresies*, book iii. c. 12. *Eng. Works*, p. 228.

³ *i.e.* chantry priests.

⁴ Dean Colet's *Convocation Sermon*.

⁵ *Conciliorum delectorum Cardinalium et aliorum prælatorum de emendanda ecclesia*, 1538.

is an old almanack, and under similar circumstances the same events may yet return. There is nothing in the national character which will prevent us from sinking as deeply as Naples or Spain, with reference to clerical morality. We were once, at least, as low as either of these countries. The subject is an unpleasant one, and we gladly pass it by as briefly as possible. With Mr. Froude, we may confess that when we began to examine into this matter, we did so with an impression that the clergy, before the Reformation, had been unjustly charged. With him we would now gladly escape from such a subject. Words give but a feeble conception of the degradation of the body of the priesthood. This is unmistakably stamped upon every page of the writings of every one of the apologists of the Church. We shall not attempt to cite cases of individual sin, unsatisfactory and inconclusive as this must needs be. No age or condition of the Church can hope to be exempt from the scandals of 'criminous clerks;' but the language of official documents and of the zealous defenders of the clerical order at that time is totally irreconcilable with the belief that the scandalously immoral formed the minority of that body. At the Council of Constance we find the Cardinal-bishop of Cambray exclaiming, 'The merciful Lord avert from His Church this reproach, that *every* prelate, priest, or other ecclesiastic, should be found guilty of this lamentable charge. As, formerly, God reserved to himself seven thousand who had not bowed their knees to Baal, so now we may believe that in every condition of the Church *some* can be found who, inflamed with Christian zeal, will set about their own reformation; and, by their precepts and examples, amend others.'¹ In answer to charges of gross immorality brought too sweepingly against the whole body of the English priesthood, Sir Thomas More never ventures beyond, 'Though there be many amongst the clergy full bad, . . . yet are there, again, therein many right virtuous folk.'² Of this there could be no doubt; and yet that the openly wicked were numerous enough to throw obloquy on the whole class, is clear, amongst other evidence, from such official language as is used by Richard the Third, in his Circular Letter to the Bishops:— 'Forasmuch as it is not only known that in every jurisdiction, as well in your pastoral care as other, there be many, as well of the spiritual party as of the temporal, delirring from the right way of virtue and good living, to the pernicious example of other, and loathsomeness of every well-disposed person: We

¹ Petri de Alliaco Cardinalis Cameracensis Canones Reformationis Ecclesie, cap. vi. in fin. Von der Hardt, Conc. Const. t. i. pt. 1. p. 433.

² English Works, 735.

'therefore will and desire you,' &c.¹ We have before quoted a part of an Act of the 4th Henry VII., ch. 13; the remainder was upon the subject of which we are now speaking. The first part of the Act referred to 'lettered' laymen claiming the benefit of clergy; the latter part has reference to criminals in orders, and attempts, by a technicality, to limit the privilege in their case. It is directed against those who 'hath been the 'more bold to commit murder, rape, robbery, theft, and all 'other mischievous deeds;' and it provides that 'if any person, 'at the second time of asking his clergy, because he is within 'orders, hath not then ready his letters of his orders, or a certificate of his ordinary, witnessing the same, that then the 'justices afore whom he is so arraigned shall give him a day by 'his discretion to bring in his said letters or certificate; and if 'he fail, and bring not in at such a day his said letters nor 'certificate, then the same person to lose the benefit of his 'clergy, as he shall do that is without orders.'² Mr. Froude has selected from the records of the Archidiaconal Courts of London some instances of the kinds of sin which were then common. The volume from which he has quoted a few cases, presents a most painful picture of wide-spread clerical profligacy; but nothing, to our mind, shows more clearly the inveteracy of the evil and the general depravity of morals, than the ludicrously light penalties with which the offender was visited. When a London rector confessed himself guilty of unchastity, and when the partner of his sin was the prioress of a neighbouring nunnery, thus making his crime of a deeper dye, and yet he was only mulcted of a sum of money equal to the week's wages of a journeyman carpenter at that time,³ little account could have been made of such sins, and the penalty itself became but another name for a licence to commit wickedness. No wonder, that whilst the courts were making themselves parties to such an abomination, when discipline was an empty name and a forgotten thing, the populace of our towns should be employed in hooting priests, monks, and friars, through the streets, and charging them with participation in such deeds of profligacy. 'Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness' sake;' but surely woe to those, and to the Church in which they are still allowed to minister, who are persecuted for unrighteousness' sake. To find a priest of fair, virtuous character, was, rightly or wrongly, thought a matter which required care; and good orthodox laymen, who loved their Church and clung to every

¹ Halliwell's *Letters of the Kings of England*, vol. i. p. 154.

² This was sometimes an expensive, if not a difficult thing to do.

³ Archdeacon Hale's *Precedents and Proceedings in Criminal Cases*, 1475—1640.

observance of religion, when on their death-bed, expressed their deep anxiety on this score. In the wills of that period we constantly meet with such language as this:—‘I will that if the said priest be not virtuously disposed, as is convenient to the order of the priesthood, that . . . the said aldermen shall . . . avoid him, and purvey another priest of good guiding’ (1492). ‘I will that a good and virtuous priest read and sing for me; and if he be not virtuous, I pray you that be mine executors, let him be changed’ (1501). ‘I will that if my priest or priests be not well-disposed and of good conversation, then I will that they shall be put out’¹ (1504). But we gladly pass from this hateful topic; on the sins of the clergy of that day let the veil of obscurity for ever rest. Sins they were which had long before destroyed their influence, and had made religion itself despised. Had Mahomedanism or decent paganism offered themselves as a refuge from the only form of ‘the Catholic religion’ with which the people of this country was acquainted, they would, in all human probability, have been preferred by great numbers to that powerless, worn-out, debauched Christianity, which was spread over the land. Spasmodic efforts were, it is true, here and there made to restrain the clergy from notorious crime; but the utter failure of all such efforts proved that sin had taken too deep root to be corrected by any power wielded by the ecclesiastical authorities of that day. The salt had, in truth, lost its savour; it was cast out; it was ‘trodden under foot of men.’

Great have been the advantages which not only devotion, but political civilisation, have received from monastic establishments. In times of disturbance, they were the places of comparative peace; in days of ignorance, the retreats of learning; in periods of profligacy, the abodes of devotion. Men and women who fled there from the trials of the world found cities of refuge from every temptation except those of the heart, the flesh, and the devil. It is no slight benefit to us that they preserved from destruction many of the precious treasures of Roman and Greek intellect; that they fostered the fragile flowers of art, and sometimes encouraged the development of human skill. In the rich slopes of meadow and of pasture land which stretched around the towers tenanted by the Carthusian and Benedictine brethren, agriculture advanced almost to the dignity of a science, and within the walls of convent gardens horticulture was sheltered into comparative perfection. We, who

¹ Bury Wills, published by Camden Society.

² It is evident that paganism was at this time not only making itself felt and respected in literature and the arts, but that, in its religious aspect, it was taking hold of those on whom Christianity could have little or no influence.

look upon the ruins of Tintern and of Fountains, are able at best to form a vague idea of those stately houses in the times of their prosperity. At the period of which we write it was as difficult for those who looked upon the moral ruin to recognise in these establishments the chosen abodes of learning, of sanctity, and of self-denial. For many years before the beginning of the sixteenth century so great a decline was evident in the whole of the religious houses, that men of every shade of opinion considered their fall to be inevitable. Scarcely any of the abbeys were able to procure sufficient inmates to maintain their numbers.¹ Letters of dispensation, by which the monks were freed from their vows, and enabled to enter upon secular occupations, were frequent, and the numbers of runaways who dispensed with a formal dispensation increased. The cells and smaller monasteries were often abandoned, from the difficulty of finding occupants; and their lands were transferred to the parent abbey, or appropriated to the uses of education. Everything boded the approaching extinction of monastic institutions. Popular predictions, which show the temper, and keep alive the expectations, of a nation, had long before declared,—

“Ther shal come a kyng,
And confesse you religiouses,
And hete yow as the bible telleth,
For brekyng of youre rule;
And amende monyals,
Monkes and chanons,
And puten to hir penaunce
Ad pristinum statum ire.”²

The firm conviction of the impending fall of these societies was felt as a reason for the endowment of colleges rather than of monasteries. In place of the foundation of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, it had been at first the intention of Bishop Fox to endow a religious house; from this he was, however, dissuaded by the remark of Oldham, Bishop of Exeter, that the monks had already more than they were long likely to keep. This was not the belief only of far-seeing statesmen. Plain John Baret, citizen of Seynt Edmunds Bury, when leaving by will, in 1463, an endowment for a chantry priest, is careful to provide, ‘If the office of Saint Mary priest fail, as God defend,

¹ See 27 Henry VIII. c. 28. This same decay of the continental monasteries is asserted by the writers of the period. Gerson speaks of those which scarcely had a tenth part of their proper number of monks, others absolutely without one inmate. Joannes Gerson, *de Modo Reformandi Ecclesiam*, apud Von der Hardt, *Genev. Const. t. i. pt. 4. p. 91.*

² *Piers Plowman*, 6233—46.

then I will that the parish priest have as much, &c.;'¹ without referring to the general moral condition of the monastic body, a subject from which we gladly shrink, it was clear to observers, long before the close of the fifteenth century, that the most trivial circumstance alone was required to cause their overthrow. Without doubt many causes concurred to render the suppression of the monasteries a popular measure. Cupidity may be allowed some weight, though by no means so large a share as is commonly supposed.² The jealousy of trade, some branches of which were interfered with, if not almost monopolized, by these societies, had its natural influence.³ The classical infidelity of the renaissance, which regarded these institutions with contempt, together with political circumstances and the private passions of the king, may all have swelled the torrent of popular feeling. But these combined would have been insufficient to cause the overthrow of the monastic orders, and much of the indifference and enmity with which they were regarded can only be accounted for by granting all that their opponents allege. The ease with which they were suppressed is sufficient to convince us that the life which once existed in these religious corporations had greatly decayed, if not utterly ceased. Hence they no longer possessed that influence which contemplative piety or religious energy will exert even over the unbeliever. The members of the monastic bodies in this country were popularly regarded as luxurious, slothful, covetous, and consequently useless; and against this no prescription, however venerable—no immunity, however sacred—will long avail. That which is dead will not be allowed to cumber the ground, and traditional excellency is no substitute for present vitality. In estimating the forces required for the overthrow of old institutions, we must remember, that to extinguish corporate life, or to maintain corporate privileges after life has departed, is in either case all but impossible. Whether the monasteries could have been reformed, may be doubted. With whatever suspicion we naturally regard the reports of the visitors, it must not be forgotten that the firmest friends of the papacy advised their utter extinction. A twelvemonth after the Act of Par-

Bury Wills, p. 18.

² 'I never found, in all my time while I was conversant in the court, of all the nobility of this land, above the number of seven (of which seven there are now three dead) that ever I perceived to be of the mind that it was either right or reasonable, or could be to the realm profitable, without lawful cause, to take any possessions away from the clergy.'—More's Apology, ch. xxii. He afterwards (Debellacion of Salem and Byzance, cvi.) explains this statement to mean that there were not seven who in any way thought that the possession of the clergy could be secularized, and not one who thought it 'right, reasonable, and profitable.'

³ Dodd's Church History (ed. Tierney). vol. i. p. 251. • Lewis's Life of Fisher, vol. ii. p. 85. More's Utopia, pt. 2

liament of 1536 had directed the suppression of all 'religious houses of monks, canons, and nuns, which may not dispend manors, &c., above the clear yearly value of 200*l.*; and 'where the congregation of religious persons is under the number of twelve,'¹ Pope Paul III. appointed a Committee of nine of the most eminent ecclesiastics in the Western Church, and directed them to examine into the state of the Church, and to advise as to its reformation. Of this Council four were afterwards raised to the Cardinalate; four were already known as the ablest members of the Conclave. The orthodoxy of Contarini, Sadolet, Caraffa, and Pole, is, we believe, unimpeachable. They had just witnessed the suppression of the smaller monasteries in England. Not only did they entirely acquiesce in that act, but they were urgent to outstrip it. So universal and inveterate did they consider the corruption of the monastic bodies, and so hopeless the prospect of reforming them, that they united in recommending the total suppression of every monastery in Europe. When these men could say, '*Conventuales ordines abolendos esse putamus omnes*,'² we cannot but be sure that they were in possession of facts with regard to the general state of the monasteries which would fully substantiate the evidence collected by the Commissioners of Henry the Eighth. Nothing short of this would have elicited or can justify so sweeping a condemnation. Facts are strikingly at variance with present popular belief. If charges of the foulest living be a calumny against the nuns of that day, then Bishop Fisher is a greater calumniator than any agent of Mr. Vicar-General Cromwell; and if the seizure of the lands of religious houses, and their appropriation to other purposes, were a sin, it is one that Pole and Fisher are answerable for even more than Wolsey and Henry the Eighth. In seizing the nunnery of Higham,³ after a vain attempt at its reformation, Fisher set the example, and justified subsequent confiscations; and, as we have just shown, Pole not only advised an universal sequestration of all convents, but on his arrival in England did not scruple to receive a grant of abbey lands for his own use. In fact whilst the reforming party in the Church were pleading for the preservation of some of the convents, the opposite party were contending for their utter overthrow. Latimer would have spared what Gardiner joined in extinguishing.

¹ 27 Henry VIII. c. 28.

² *Concilium Delectorum Cardinalium*, &c. 1537.

³ See the details in Lewis's *Life of Fisher*, Appendix, vol. ii.

⁴ 'To my Lord Cardinal's Grace, for one hole yeres rent of the tythes of Kirkbie-upon-the-hill, Norton, Cundall and others, 3*8l.* 12*s.* 4*d.*,' parts of the dissolved priory of Newburgh, granted to him doubtless by Queen Mary.—Will of William Kayvett, 1557, and Note of Editor in '*Richmond Wills*,' p. 102. (*Surtees Soc. Publication.*)

We have sought from unexceptional authorities to ascertain the state of the Christian commonwealth—the Catholic Church as it manifested itself not merely in the convent and within the walls of the parish church, but as it acted upon and influenced the whole body of its members. Such a sketch, however, would be incomplete, unless we extended our view so as to take in those who should have been the governors of the Church, and who had been consecrated as the overseers of the flock of Christ.

Mr. Macaulay, in a lively chapter of his *History*, thus speaks of the clerical body before the Reformation: ‘The place of the clergyman in society had been completely changed by the Reformation. Before that event ecclesiastics had formed the majority of the House of Lords—had in wealth and splendour equalled and sometimes outshone the greatest of the temporal barons—and had generally held the highest civil offices. The Lord Treasurer was often a bishop. The Lord Chancellor was almost always so. The Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal, and the Master of the Rolls, were ordinarily churchmen. Churchmen transacted the most important diplomatic business. . . . Men who were averse to the life of camps, and who were at the same time desirous to rise in the state, ordinarily received the tonsure. Among them were sons of all the most illustrious families, and near kinsmen of the throne, Scroopes, Nevilles, Bouchiers, Staffords, and Poles. Down to the middle of the reign of Henry the Eighth, therefore, no line of life bore so inviting an aspect to ambitious and covetous natures as the priesthood. Then came a violent revolution . . . The princely splendour of William of Wykeham, and of William of Waynflete had disappeared. The scarlet hat of the cardinal and the silver cross of the legate was no more . . . Thus the sacerdotal office lost its attractions for the higher classes . . . The clergy were regarded on the whole as a plebeian class. And indeed for one who made the figure of a gentleman, ten were mere menial servants.’¹

Mr. Macaulay’s facts are often no better than his inferences. It is true that before the sixteenth century a Neville, a Bouchier, and a Stafford—he might have added a Beaufort and a Plantagenet—were to be found amongst the bishops of the English Church; but beyond this fact, which was a symbol of the weakness, and not of the strength, of the Church, the statement of Mr. Macaulay must be received with considerable limitations, and his view of the effect of the Reformation on the social state of the clergy at large is altogether a mistaken one. So far as can be ascertained, that event had little immediate influence one way or another upon the position or the character of the cleri-

¹ *History of England*, vol. I. chap. iii.

cal body. 'The Church in this country was far from our ideal of perfection under the Stuart kings; but low as was her condition in the time of Charles the Second, it was immeasurably more degraded under the house of Lancaster, and during the reign of the first two kings of the house of Tudor. Nor is it any presumption to the contrary that before the Reformation the sons of the greatest nobles were often enrolled in the ranks of the Episcopate, and that for long after that time the position of a priest was regarded as beneath the ambition of a gentleman.' The inference drawn by Mr. Macaulay from the names he registers, as to the state of the clergy and the influence of the Church, is not borne out by history.

During the whole period from the Norman Conquest until the Reformation, two circumstances weakened the efficiency and diminished the natural influence of the Church. From the reign of William the First until that of Edward the Third, two antagonistic races occupied this part of our island, and from the smaller, but dominant one, the bishops were almost exclusively chosen. When we remember that for several generations such bishops were called upon to govern and direct a laity and clergy whose speech was unknown to them, and who were rendered sullen and hostile by the oppression of their Norman conquerors, we shall feel that but little sympathy could exist between such shepherds and their flocks. His ignorance of both the language and the temper of the English was pleaded by Lanfranc as a reason for his wish to resign the see of Canterbury.² Other bishops, however, were less scrupulous. The serfs of Lincolnshire and the burghers of York clung with tenacity to the rude, forcible Saxon of their fathers; whilst the French and Italian prelates disdained the use of any other tongues than the courtlier Norman or the fashionable Provençal. An unsatisfactory and imperfect medium of communication existed, it is true, in the common ecclesiastical language, but this was chiefly confined to official documents and the records of the

¹ "Why doth the foolish world scorn that profession
Whose joys pass peace? Why do they think unfit
That gentry should join families with it?"

Down: 'To Mr. Tilman after he had taken Orders.'

A friend of George Herbert's, so Walton mentions, tried to 'persuade him to alter his resolution to enter into sacred orders, as too mean an employment, and too much below his birth.' And Cave, in dedicating his 'Primitive Christianity' to the Bishop of Oxford (Crewe) compliments him on 'the great honour which your Lordship has done, not to the Episcopal only, but to the whole ministerial order, that a person of your rank and education would stoop to an employment so little valued and regarded in this unthankful and degenerate age.' These, however, and other proofs that might be cited of the low estimation in which the ministry of the Church was held, are not peculiar to post-reformation times. The position and influence of the clerical body was, as we have shown, lower and less considerable before the time of Henry the Eighth.

² Collier's Eccles. Hist. vol. ii. p. 12 (Ed. 1845).

courts of Law. When at length the two races had been blended into one nation, speaking but one language, and Norman and Saxon had become English, the inconvenience no longer existed. Shortly before that period, however, the mischief of 'papal provisions' was beginning to be felt, and from that time the bishoprics and wealthier benefices were often filled by Italians who, in a remote land, enjoyed the revenues without being able to perform the duties for which the endowment had been given. It has been questioned which of these two evils was the greatest.¹ On the one hand, the presence of the Norman bishop perpetually reminded his people of national disaster and oppression. On the other hand, the virtues of Italian prelates who never visited their sees were of necessity unknown. Under such circumstances some may think it difficult to determine whether the residency of Ralph de Flambard was not a greater curse than the non-residency of Silvester de Gigles: without attempting to adjust the balance between these two evils, we may remark that the first is the more excusable, since, if not inevitable, yet it arose naturally out of the circumstances of the country. The intrusion of Italian prelates, however, was not only as great an inconvenience, but was also a sin on the part of the Pope, who, in defiance of continual remonstrances and struggles, clung to an abuse which equally added to the wealth of the Roman Court, and alienated and exasperated the whole body of the English people.

It is but an unsatisfactory answer to this; to say that the bishops appointed by the Crown were often as little able to add dignity or weight to their office, and to perform their spiritual duties as these Italians. The frequent unfitness of bishops made by the direct influence of the Crown rendered the intrusion of alien prelates a greater hardship to the Church, thus on both sides deprived of her proper pastors. The nominees of the Sovereign were but too often men distinguished chiefly for 'diplomatic activity,' or the younger and youthful children of the greater nobility. Mr. Hallam speaks of the bishops of the middle ages as 'generally appointed before they had arrived at canonical age.'² How far this is borne out by records we cannot say, though the appointment of children was certainly not exceptional; and in the case of the sons of baronial houses, they were more frequently minors than otherwise. Thus, the names recorded by Mr. Macaulay are not those of noble birth, who condescended to the service of the sanctuary, but of those who made the Church to minister to the needs of nobility. The history of the appointment of two of these 'sons of the most illustrious families' will, however, best illustrate the mode

¹ Dodd. Ch. Hist. edit. Tierney, vol. i. p. 143; note.

² History of the Middle Ages, vol. ii. p. 175; note (Ed. 1855).

of making bishops in the times immediately preceding the Reformation.

George Neville, Bishop of Exeter, Chancellor of England, and afterwards Archbishop of York, is now chiefly remembered for the largeness of the bill of fare at his installation feast. He was son of Richard, Earl of Salisbury, the friend and counsellor of Richard of York. His uncle was Bishop of Durham from 1437 to 1457. His brother was the last of the barons—'the King-maker, Warwick.' Whilst a minor and a laic, the Privy Council, then under the influence of his powerful relatives, 'advised and assented,' on the 30th March, 1454, 'considering 'the *bloode*, vertue, and cunningg that Maister George Neville 'soone to therle of Salisbury, Chancellor of England, is of, that 'he shoulde be recommended to the holy fadre for to be promoted to the next bisshoppriche that shalle voide within this 'reaume.'¹ As death could not be calculated upon, and detraction, in the case of an obstinate bishop, was a hazardous experiment; he was a few months afterwards collated to the Archdeaconry of Northampton, and, after the lapse of four months (Dec. 21, 1454), received the first tonsure.* In September of the following year the death of Lacy, Bishop of Exeter, left the road open to 'Master Neville.' In order, however, to give a monopoly of bishoprics and benefices to approved Lancastrians, an earlier ordinance of the Privy Council had provided that 'when they 'voiden, such as be the king's own servants, and have served 'his father or grandfather, be preferred unto them like as it 'hath been promised often, and assured before this, so that they 'have no cause to complain, as it is said they do daily, for lack 'of furthering.'² The King, who had been compelled to nominate the uncle Robert Neville to the Palatinate see of Durham, had no desire to strengthen the same family, and the Yorkist faction, by the promotion of the active and youthful nephew; and in hot haste nominated John Halse, Archdeacon of Norwich, to the vacant see, who was accordingly appointed by papal provision.³ Neither King nor Pope, however, was powerful enough to resist effectually the house of Salisbury. The king, in November, was compelled to write to the pope, pleading forgetfulness of the Privy Council's arrangement, and his own promise; and showing that Cornwall required a man of might as its bishop, which, as poor John Halse was of no family, could not have been his case. In December this was followed by a letter of the Privy Council, specially recommending George Neville,

¹ Acts of Privy Council, vol. vi. p. 168.

* Ibid. vol. iv, p. 28.

² The Letter recommending John Halse, and signed by Henry the Sixth, and Queen Margaret, is still in the Chapter Archives.

³ *Foedera*, vol. xi. p. 367, edit. 1727.

who, in obedience to a *congé d'élire*, had already been chosen by the Canons of Exeter as their Bishop. The Pope cancelled his first letter of provision; John Halse withdrew his claim under a promise of the next bishopric, and Crown, Chapter, and Pope, having reconsidered the matter, accepted the Yorkist nominee.

Such, in the fifteenth century, was but too often the history of appointments to bishoprics. At the same meeting of the Privy Council, in which the *blood* of Master George Neville had thus been rewarded with a bishopric, 'It was advised and ordained, at the desire and request of the Council of this land, that the right reverend Father in God, the Bishop of Ely, for his great might, virtue, and *great blood* that he is of, should be recommended to be promoted to the see of Canterbury.'¹ The claims, indeed, of Thomas Bouchier were of no ordinary kind. Son to the Earl of Essex, and, on his mother's side, grandson of the Plantagenets, he had, whilst still a youth, been appointed to the valuable deanery of S. Martin's-le-Grand. In Dec. 1433, he was elected, in compliance with a mandate from the Crown, to the bishopric of Worcester. The preceding Bishop had died at Basle whilst attending the council held in that city. The Pope, as soon as the death of Bishop Polton was known, 'provided to this see Thomas Brown, Dean of Salisbury . . . then at the council.'² The interest, however, of Thomas Bouchier, sufficed to set aside this 'provision,' and the Pope ultimately consented to cancel the appointment of Brown, and to issue a bull directing the appointment of Bouchier, who, some months before, had been elected to the vacant see.³ On the 30th March, 1454, on the death of Archbishop Kempe, the Privy Council, as we have just seen, 'ordained' the translation of Bouchier, then Bishop of Ely, to the archiepiscopal see of Canterbury. On the 3d of April, the Prior and Monks of Christ Church, in that city, having met and received this mandate, sued for permission to elect,⁴ received in due time a *congé d'élire*, and returned as the object of their choice the nominee of the Privy Council.

These, on the whole, are fair specimens of the motives which dictated the selection, and illustrations of the mode in which bishops were appointed, in the years immediately preceding the sixteenth century. Indeed, this very appointment of Thomas Bouchier to the metropolitan see is cited by Collier as an

¹ Acts of Privy Council, vol. vi. p. 265.

² Le Neve's Fasti Eccles. Ang. vol. iii. p. 61; note (ed. Hardy).

³ Acts of Privy Council, vol. iv. p. 183. The *congé d'élire*, signed by the King and Council, was issued 22d Nov. 1433, and states that Thomas Bouchier was nominated at the request of Parliament, and in 'consideration of nighness of blood . . . and the cunning and virtue that resten in his person.'

⁴ Acts of Privy Council, vol. vi. p. 170.

instance of a more than usually free election.¹ In what that freedom consisted it is difficult to discover. At all times the *congé d'élire* was as unreal as it is in our own day. The direct influence of the Crown, or rather of political parties, Lancastrian or Yorkist—the Whig or Tory of the fifteenth century—was as great as now. There were, however, always occurring more scandalous nominations, too common, perhaps, to be regarded as exceptions, but attended with resistance, or other circumstances which prevented such appointments being more frequently made. When, for instance, Henry Beaufort, ‘the offspring, begotten by double avowtry’ of John of Gaunt and Catherine Swineford, was to be elevated to the Episcopate, his ‘great blood’ procured him consecration, and revolted at the poverty of the only see—Llandaff—open to his ambition. This, however, was arranged in a manner which savoured of the violence of the age, but which gives but a poor idea of its ecclesiastical discipline. At the request of the Crown, the Pope directed the translation of the aged Bishop of Lincoln to the inferior see; and in defiance of his remonstrances, and in spite of his refusal to undertake the oversight of a Welsh diocese, Henry Beaufort was intruded into the cathedral which John de Bokingham can hardly be said to have relinquished.²

Few instances, indeed, occur of any one of noble birth taking orders, except as the immediate preliminary to his intrusion into accumulated benefices or a bishopric. There, without any of the restraints thought necessary to an ecclesiastic beyond the name of marriage, he found in the sacred revenues of the Church a provision which the law of primogeniture denied him from the ancestral estates of his family. Between such a bishop and the priests of his diocese there could be no sympathy, and but little communication. His splendid equipage seldom, however, provoked their jealousy. He was not expected to reside within the limits of his bishopric, which he was not fitted to direct.³ The profuse luxuriousness of his table, which rivalled the board of Heliogabalus, was not hospitality. The retinue with which he was surrounded was calculated, indeed, to strike the senses; but the silver crosses and the gay processional copes, the sleek mules and the well-fed hounds, but poorly atoned for the virtues of a pastor and the presence of one who should have been a director and an evangelist.

¹ *Eccles. History*, vol. iii. p. 387.

² ‘Henricus Beaufort filius Joannis ducis Lancastrie et Catarinae Swineford, admodum juvenis factus episcopus Lincoln, fere per vim detruso Joanne de Bokingham sene episcopo anno Richardi 2ⁱ. 21^o.’—*Leland's Collectanea*, vol. iii., p. 405.

³ Bishop Kempe, the predecessor of Thomas Bouchier both in the sees of Ely and Canterbury, performed mass only once in the cathedral of the first-named diocese, though he held that bishopric for ten years.

The whole *rationale* of the episcopate in those days differed so greatly, both from the design of its institution and from the decencies of modern practice, that it is difficult for a reader to understand it. The sovereign possessed no civil list. There were no pensions at the disposal of the minister or favourite. The landed property of the crown, if alienated, would not suffice to reward the ability nor to satisfy the expectation of all public servants. There remained only the property of the Church available; and able diplomatists, successful pleaders, assiduous secretaries, when worn out by secular labours, and sometimes veteran soldiers, were rewarded with ecclesiastical possessions, and bound to the performance of spiritual duties of which they were altogether ignorant. Those who have remarked the preponderance of clergymen in the secular offices of the State, have fancied that this arose from the inability of laymen to perform the duties of such offices. This is not even partially true. It is attributable to the narrow revenues of the Crown, and the want of means to reward the exertions of laymen. This difficulty was too often obviated by the profanation of orders, and by adding to the emoluments of the king's kitchen or mint an archdeaconry or a deanery. Thus, to take the most favourable of all instances, it was the secular ability of William of Wykeham which led him to be rewarded, whilst a layman, with wealthy benefices, and eventually a bishopric, not the eminent ability of the priest which caused his employment in secular matters. Whether all this tended even to the stability of the *establishment* may be doubted. Whether the presence of the sons of noblemen, purchased at such a price, and occasionally enrolled amongst the bishops, added to the efficiency of the Church, will be questioned. That the system worked ill in those days; that it produced scandal, disgust, and strenuous resistance; and that at length its own internal weakness caused its overthrow, will be acknowledged by all who are acquainted with the literature and the official records of the closing years of the Middle Ages.

At the accession of Henry VIII., ecclesiastical propriety was in many respects more rigidly regarded than heretofore; yet even then the episcopal office was in a great measure sacrificed to the convenience or the needs of the sovereign or the pontiff. In the early part of this reign, the bishopric of Worcester was held by Jerome de Ghinucci, the third Italian who in succession had occupied this see; that of Salisbury was possessed by Cardinal Campeggio; Landaff, by George Athequa, a Spaniard. Bath and Wells, after having been held for fourteen years by Cardinal Hadrian de Castello, on his resignation of the see of Hereford, and for five more in *commendam* with York by Cardinal Wolsey,

was then conferred on John Clerk, Ambassador at the Court of the Emperor. Other bishops were withdrawn for years from their dioceses, and employed as residents at foreign courts. If we suppose that the Lord Chancellor (Wareham), the Master of the Rolls (Tunstall), and the Lord Privy Seal (Fox), were at the same time able to administer the duties of these secular offices, and to perform their spiritual functions as bishops, still, even then, more than a fourth of the whole number of the bishops were utterly unknown to the people of their bishoprics; and on the most important debates on ecclesiastical matters, such as the suppression of the convents and the supremacy of the Crown, the hierarchy of England was represented by seven bishops.

Great saints sometimes arise from the depth of great corruptions. As a general rule, however, the spiritual degeneracy of the age makes itself seen in the feeble religionism of all classes. We know not which is the more unsatisfactory point in this survey of civil and religious society in England,—the utter want of religious control which was evident in the mass, or the readiness with which the Church conformed herself to those who were in some degree faithful to the yoke that she offered them. The Holy Communion was received once a-year; indeed, one of the objections urged against the Reformation by the Cornish rebels was the attempt to make 'at the least three times a-year' the future rule of the Church. Margaret of Richmond is held up as a pattern to a lax age, because she was wont to communicate 'near a dozen times every year.'¹ As to fasting, the Church, throughout this country at least, directed vespers to be 'said and sung' before noon, so that the ecclesiastical rule of fasting until evening might be seemingly carried out even whilst it was really neglected.² Such a manner of playing fast and loose with the conscience was not calculated to win the respect of those for whose benefit this piece of indulgent casuistry was engrafted upon that religion, which, the more it raised the soul above the things of earth, was careful the more to inculcate the duties of a straightforward and manly uprightness. The world and the Church were mutually acting upon each other, and mutually corrupting each other.

In no quarter did there appear much hope of reconstructing a society out of such a chaos. The 'different opinions' of which

¹ Lewis' *Life of Fisher*, vol. i. p. 37.

² 'The Church, to condescend unto our infirmity, hath been fain to say in Lent their Evensong before noon; and besides the natural days to devise us new days, *ex actione juris*, that we should, at the least, have Evensong in the Lenten fast before we fall to meat. And yet we keep not that neither.'—Sir Thomas More's *Apology*, ch. xxxi. *English Works*, p. 895.

the Venetian ambassador had spoken, were every day sundering the only remaining social bond—a common sentiment of devotion. Religion, the tie which holds humanity together, and, binding man to man, binds him also to God, was almost broken. From the one end of Europe to the other, men had long been plaintively calling for some authority earnestly to set about a reformation of manners. For two centuries the cry was unheeded, and corruption had become more corrupt. Princes never met, but the one anxious subject on which they conferred, or were suspected of conferring, was as to the means of curbing the sins of their people, even if they took no thought of their own. Christendom was full of shakings, and doubts, and heresies, and all moral corruptions; and England was, in all respects, a part of the general body of Christendom. In vain did the Lord Chancellor publish his witty and convincing ‘dialogues, confutations, and apologies:’ in the abstract they might have been successful; but when men opened their windows upon the concrete mass of wickedness in sacred and unsacred places, they needed no arguments, and were proof against any defence of such a worthless reality. The torrent of indignation could, indeed, be repressed; but nothing could shield the Church against the far more dangerous weapon of contempt. And whilst Archdeacons were punishing those who treated priests with contempt; and religious, honest-minded laymen were trying, with great pains—as so difficult a matter required—to devise means of discovering ‘virtuous priests,’ to sing mass for their souls, and Sir Thomas More was jesting pleasantly on the frailties and the ignorance of the clergy, and men were disputing of and denying the immortality of the soul,—the Church was sinking daily deeper and deeper into disorder, and the clergy into profligacy. Then it was that statesmen who saw nothing before them but a shoreless waste of waters, who had a passive habit of relying on the Church, but no faith in her divine mission, and were ready to give up all hope if the anchorage of the Papacy should fail them, strove to rectify all disorders by the vulgar remedies of the rack and the faggot. All would not do; men were asking, sometimes with little respect, but always with importunity, for the bread of life,—and the cries of hunger were not to be appeased by fire, and a stone.

We have, as we have before said, no intention of measuring and determining the far-goings or the short-comings of the Reformation in this country. When that history is worthily written, let the reformation of society which was then effected be no longer forgotten. Without losing sight of questions about the Papal see and the supremacy of Rome, ‘provisions,’

'annates,' 'first-fruits,' and 'appeals,' let it be remembered that men had then to be brought under the yoke of moral restraint, to be taught truthfulness, and to be rescued from the supremacy of perjury. What was done, like all work in times of confusion, cannot expect to be accepted in days of complacent routine. It was done under His guidance from Whom 'every good gift and every perfect gift cometh,' by men hampered by average human weakness, and fettered by ordinary human infirmity. Those who do God's work are men suited to the age; and to be far above the times even in moral purity is often fatal to all good influence. The works they do, bear for ever with them the stamp of man's imperfection: His footmarks are seen in the marvels effected by such an imperfect administration.

- ART. IV.—1. *Popular Astronomy*. By FRANÇOIS ARAGO, Perpetual Secretary of the Academy of Sciences. Translated from the Original and Edited by Admiral W. H. Smyth, D.C.L. For. Sec. R. S. &c., and Robert Grant, Esq. M. A. F.R.A.S. In Two Volumes. Vol. I. London: Longman, Brown, Green, and Longmans. 1855.
2. *Outlines of Astronomy*. By SIR JOHN F. W. HERSCHEL, Bart. K. H. &c. Fourth Edition. London: Longman, Brown, Green, and Longmans. 1851.

WE suppose most persons have been encouraged in their early efforts to master the First Book of Euclid by the quotation of the Greek geometrician's answer to Ptolemy, that there was no royal road to geometry—*μη εἶναι βασιλικὴν ὁδὸν πρὸς γεωμετρίαν*. The sentiment does but express a truth which admits of a much wider application; and, if stated in language adapted to these times, would run as follows:—There is no popular road to science. If we were disposed to exhibit the same truth as a Roman would have viewed it, we should give it in the still wider generalization of the words of Virgil—

‘ Nil sine magno

Vita labore dedit mortalibus.’—

And yet, from the immense number of popular treatises on science, one might be disposed to think that the nineteenth century has at least made an attempt to disprove the truth of this assertion. Indeed, it is but the natural consequence of books being written on all other subjects for the million, that some effort should be made to popularize science; and the difficulty of the task has not deterred either shallow or deep thinkers from making the attempt. The mere enumeration of the volumes that have been written on subjects of physical science during the last quarter of a century, would occupy more space than is devoted to the whole of this article. One evidence of success these treatises certainly possess: in commercial language, they have sold, and, we may reasonably infer, have also paid; what success they have met with beyond this, it would be difficult to estimate; for, in point of fact, there is no standard by which to measure the success, nor would it be easy, if a standard were agreed upon, to ascertain the facts from which we should be enabled to pronounce a judgment.

If it be asked, what peculiar difficulty there is in writing a popular treatise on a scientific subject? the answer is, that science alone, of all the subjects of human knowledge, must

make sacrifice of that which is its very essence, in the attempt to make itself intelligible to the vulgar. We speak now, especially, of those physical sciences, whose principles have been ascertained to so great a degree of accuracy, as to allow of their being reduced to mathematical calculation. Other subjects, including even those of the fine arts, may, by skilful treatment, be reduced, for a considerable part, to the level of ordinary comprehensions, and may be rendered intelligible to those who have neither the time nor the inclination to pursue them further. History, for instance, in the hands of a judicious and powerful writer, may be rendered both instructive and interesting to the student who does not mean to make this subject the business of his life. And, in adapting himself to such class of readers, a historian does not need carefully to keep out of view principles which his readers will not be able to follow, or to forego arguments which to himself are conclusive, because of the inability of his pupils to appreciate their value or understand their expression.

Or, to take another instance from one of the fine arts,—the study of architecture has been of late years rendered acceptable to a very large class of people by means of popular manuals and handbooks; whilst the greatest writer on art of whom we can boast, has largely contributed to this popularity: yet no one would accuse Mr. Ruskin of keeping in the background the principles of art, or confining himself to superficial descriptions or disquisitions.

In both these, as well as in many similar cases, the popular treatise may be a good,—we do not say that it is necessarily the best,—foundation on which to build an accurate and extensive knowledge of the subject in hand; and it may, at least, have served to give the original impulse without which the study never would have been taken in hand, or supplied the interest, the want of which would have kept the student from pursuing the subject upon which he had once entered. This method of study is not, indeed, without one serious disadvantage, viz., the liability to create a distaste for the facts and minute details of the subject, which are necessary to the complete understanding of its principles and their results; and thus the learner may attain but a partial and superficial knowledge, for want of having seen general principles exemplified in particular instances, and illustrated in variety of applications. This is precisely the evil which almost invariably attaches to any attempt to build an acquaintance with the physical sciences upon the foundation of popular treatises. It is singular to observe, how the very word popular has gradually come, in this relation, to have the meaning of unscientific and inaccurate. People would scarcely like to

acknowledge their fondness for unscientific works in science, the contradiction in terms being so glaring when they are brought into such close juxtaposition; yet, in point of fact, we believe this is the notion which most people possess of what are commonly called popular treatises on Physical Science; and whether this be the common opinion or not, it is without doubt true that this class of treatises has to make sacrifice of that instrument which alone can ensure the learner's being able entirely to comprehend their arguments and their scope. It is not here, as in other departments of human knowledge, where the defect at the commencement may be atoned for and in part remedied, by attention at the subsequent stages of the progress; the start here is made upon wrong principles, and, from the nature of the case, prejudices him who has made it against the attempt to set out anew on right principles, as well as obscures his view, and renders him unable to distinguish accurately between those truths which he has derived from the one source, and those which he is endeavouring to trace up to the other. To illustrate our position, let us take the case of mechanical science. We will suppose a person whose bent of mind is in this direction, and who is without that previous acquaintance with algebra and geometry which, in our opinion, ought to form a necessary part of all University education, and be regarded as a *sine qua non* in the examination for the first degree. Such a person will, with common diligence and interest in the subject, soon become far better acquainted with the practical details of the subject than the student who has made it part of his mathematical studies, and has with it obtained the highest honours at one of our Universities. Whilst the latter has, from the necessity of the case, confined his attention to abstract investigations, and solved problems which exist only in idea, and knows comparatively little of the modifications which his formulæ must undergo before they can exhibit results at all corresponding with observation and experiment; the other is familiarly acquainted with the practical working of machines, and is certainly able to make a far greater display of his knowledge, however inferior it may be in real value. Now we say that the knowledge that this man possesses will actually be in his way, and prove an obstacle to his thorough mastering of his subject, if ever he should propose to himself such a task. The knowledge which he possesses will not only give him a distaste for the dry and apparently barren analytical investigations, which, to the regularly educated mathematician, are, independently of any practical application, full of beauty, but deprives him also of that satisfaction which the other from time to time experiences, in acquiring that practical knowledge to which his theory

conducts him. We are even inclined to think that the student who has been regularly instructed in pure mathematics, will stand a better chance of making progress in mechanics, supposing him entirely ignorant of the subject beforehand, than in the case of his being well read in popular works upon it. We do not assert this positively; and, indeed, it is probable that upon differently constituted minds this preparation would act in different ways; but, in the general, we make no doubt but that a wide and superficial acquaintance with scientific subjects acts as a very decided barrier to the acquirement of a deep and accurate acquaintance with them.

In what we have said we have taken it for granted that ordinary people are able to understand the subjects treated of in such popular works, to the extent that they can be rendered intelligible without the aid of mathematics; but, in further disparagement of the value of such works, we have to observe, that we believe the number of persons in this predicament is very small; that the great mass of readers of these books gain nothing but confused ideas of their subject-matter—a result not much to be wondered at when the confusion of thought which many of their writers betray is taken into consideration. As the most recent instance of this style, we may refer to Mr. Hunt's 'Elementary Physics.' Still, it cannot be denied that it is possible to gain an interesting, and indeed profitable, acquaintance with the various branches of physical science from such treatises as those published by the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge, the volumes of the 'Cabinet Cyclopædia,' and others, the names of whose authors are a sufficient guarantee for the value of their works. Neither are the most elementary treatises without their value, even if they do no more than contribute to the amusement and relaxation of those whose hours of rest would otherwise be spent in less profitable employments. To this class belong such books as 'Joyce's Scientific Dialogues,' which has hitherto held its place a long time, and which we are glad to see reprinted with additions and corrections, in the Scientific Library of Mr. Bohn. The other books which we have mentioned are addressed to a higher class of readers, and, in the case of persons who are not likely to have the advantage of a stricter education, these books may be made instrumental in disciplining the mind, though we are inclined to think little use is made of them in this way, and that those who possess them, in the great majority of cases, do not advance through more than a very small portion of their contents. They are, in fact, read in a desultory way, and probably few readers surmount many of the difficulties which must of necessity occur in them. We have always felt that the chief difficulty

in these subjects was the want of opportunities of witnessing the experiments alluded to, or, what is still better for the learner, of making them for himself. Even in the metropolis, there are few facilities of this offered, except to those who can afford to pay heavily for the indulgence; and, in the country, it is next to impossible to meet with the advantages of seeing a skilful lecturer perform the requisite experiments; and even then, not one person in a hundred in the audience has the opportunity of asking for explanations, or of re-performing the experiment for himself. Without this there is little chance of the principles of the science being understood at all, and still less of their being remembered. We may give, as an easy instance of this, the ordinary explanations of specific gravity, and the common methods of ascertaining it in the cases of solid or liquid bodies. There is scarcely any difficulty in understanding the accounts given in ordinary elementary treatises of these methods; yet we suspect many persons may have laid down the book with a full belief that they understand the mode, and could easily apply it in practice, who would, nevertheless, fail in the attempt to ascertain the specific gravity of any given substance placed in their hands, for want of having never made the experiment, and performed the requisite calculations.

Every one is familiar with the Roman satirist's lines—

‘*Segnius irritant animos demissa per aures,
Quam quæ sunt oculis subjecta fidelibus;*’—

but it is only during the last twenty-five years of the present century that the maxim has been really appreciated and acted upon in systems of education. During that time, maps, plans, designs, &c., have improved in their execution in proportion as they have been more widely diffused. The comparison of any educational catalogue of this day with a similar document bearing date within the first quarter of the present century, will convince any one of the immense improvement that has taken place in this respect; whilst within the last few years, we have to notice the further advance implied in the construction of educational models of various kinds designed to facilitate the comprehension of the laws of nature, and to throw an additional interest upon their study. Thus, we now see advertised from various quarters, models to illustrate the working of the mechanical powers, the law of acceleration of falling bodies, the properties of elasticity, and the more elementary parts of the sciences of hydrostatics and pneumatics. What was formerly from its great price confined to the public lecture-room, or to amateurs whose fortunes allowed of such costly purchases, may now be procured, if not exactly by the million, at least by a

very large class of people, without any great sacrifice on their part.

And, indeed, it is almost necessary to the full understanding of the value of any experiment to have performed it oneself. We may, indeed, believe what we see another do, but it is possible we may not comprehend it till we have done it ourselves. Nor is it any objection to these models that the rude style in which they must of necessity be constructed, does not allow of any refined experiments being performed, and can exhibit in no case anything more than an approximation to the truth of theory. The former part of the objection is irrelevant, for refinements of experiments are not wanted for beginners; and, as to the latter, these rough models are precisely in the same predicament with the most elaborately constructed instruments. It is impossible, under the most favourable circumstances, to eliminate all sources of error. The difference between the finest and the coarsest style is simply one of degree; though it must be admitted that modern art has done wonders in point of accuracy, and has produced results apparently in exact correspondence with theory; and the very imperfection of the model serves the important purpose of keeping before the learner's eye the difference between abstract laws and truth, and the approximate representations of them which alone it is in our power to exhibit. In point of fact this is a truth often lost sight of, both in books and in public lectures. It was, perhaps, scarcely to be expected of public lecturers that they should be continually disparaging the most interesting portion of their lectures—viz., the experiments. The success of a lecturer depends so materially upon the skill with which he can perform delicate experiments, and an audience is so little inclined to question the exact grounds of their belief, or indeed to analyse too closely what it is they believe, that few lecturers would be found willing to explain to their hearers how little an experiment is really worth, in the way of proof, or indeed in any other way than in exhibiting in a clear light some abstract truth, which is represented as nearly as in fact it can be. But in books that make any pretensions to philosophical accuracy, it is very important that this distinction should be kept always before the reader's eye; and, we are sorry to say, that the absence of this precaution is the great blot of almost all our popular treatises on physical science, as well as in most of the works in the various branches of mechanics, which have formed the text-books at our Universities for the last thirty or forty years. We will give two instances of what we mean: one on the subject of the evidence usually adduced for the most elementary laws of motion; the other relating to the law of the

acceleration of falling bodies, which it is admitted can be rigidly demonstrated on the hypothesis of these laws being true.

With regard to the former of these, we do not mean now to enter upon the *rextata questio*, whether it is an *à priori* truth, or whether it is suggested by observation, and afterwards confirmed by experiment, and our belief in it established by its manifest utility in mechanical and astronomical science. We have our decided opinion, which we have expressed elsewhere, that this, as well as Newton's second law of motion, is an *à priori* truth; and if this be so, no amount of evidence will disturb the belief of one who has once grasped the true idea of it, either for confirmation or for throwing doubt upon it. There are, indeed, writers who, like Mr. Mill, believe that the principles of mathematical science are arrived at by induction. Such an opinion we do not wish to controvert, otherwise than by the remark that it falls to the ground by its own weight, inasmuch as our persuasion of their truth manifestly is unalterable by any amount of alleged experience. But whether the first law of motion be of this kind or not, what we are objecting to now is the form in which its illustrations in books on the subject are generally put. Nothing can be clearer than that Newton intended, by the brief illustrations which he gives of it, to put it in a clear and intelligible light. He speaks of his three laws as having been received by mathematicians and confirmed abundantly by experiment; but the amount of evidence which he gives for the first law is contained in the few following lines:—‘Projectiles persevere in their motions, so far as they are not retarded by the resistance of the air, or impelled downwards by the force of gravity. A top, whose parts by their cohesion are perpetually drawn aside from rectilinear motion, does not cease its rotation, other than as it is retarded by the air. The greater bodies of the planets and comets meeting with less resistance in more free spaces preserve their motions, both progressive and circular, for a much longer time.’

Now the evil to which we are referring is this,—that many of the mathematical treatises on mechanics which have been in use at our Universities, actually speak of these laws as being proved by experiment; and even in more philosophical writings, such, for instance, as Dr. Whewell's treatises, there is little care bestowed upon making the student see what is proved and what not, and what is the value of the evidence upon which he receives either fundamental truths or propositions deduced from them. How much is assumed, and how much logically proved, is not distinctly enough laid down. If more attention were paid to this point, the student would be saved from a great deal of that disgust for the subject which most well-instructed

students of pure mathematics have in their time felt when entering upon their first treatise on mechanics. The distress felt by logical minds at not knowing what they ought to admit, and how far they ought to feel certain of what, as far as *formulae* go, seems proved, is familiar to all who have had any experience in teaching mathematics, or who can recal their own feelings at this period of their educational course.

It cannot, indeed, too often be repeated to learners, what in the abstract no sane person would think of attempting to deny, viz., that an experiment never can prove anything beyond itself. It may, indeed, be suggestive of a principle, and generally is corroborative of an assertion previously made, but no amount of experiments can do more than make an abstract truth probable. We remember once hearing a lecturer on experimental philosophy remark, after performing the well-known experiment of the guinea and the feather, that the feather had fallen quickest; but he did not take the opportunity which the fact afforded him, of reminding his audience of the difficulty of adjusting the complicated circumstances under which experiments are made to the ideal case proposed to the mathematical theory.

This difficulty appears very strikingly in Atwood's Machine, which shall be our second instance of the unsatisfactory nature of the attempt to prove theory by experiment. We must take it for granted that our readers are acquainted with the construction of this elegant machine, and content ourselves with referring any who have never seen it or heard it described, to any elementary work on mechanics which they may happen to possess, observing only that the machine itself is very simple, and its construction easily understood, though the law which it serves to illustrate is extremely difficult for a beginner to comprehend.

This machine has been pressed to do service in two different relations. In public lectures upon mechanical science, as well as in most elementary books upon the subject, it is generally made to exhibit the truth that the spaces through which a heavy body falls vary as the squares of the times, both being reckoned from the beginning of the motion. Of this we shall only observe, that probably the impression left on the mind of an intelligent auditor is, that it proves no such result to him. He finds it extremely difficult to argue from a case of constrained motion, in which a slight preponderance of weight on one side is made to set in motion two equally balanced weights, to that of a body falling freely from its own weight. The truth is, that the experiment takes for granted that the person who witnesses it fully understands the third law of motion as enunciated

by Newton; and the difficulty of making this intelligible even to a learner who, up to this point, is accurately acquainted with the mathematical theory of a constantly accelerating force, and uniformly accelerated velocity is well known to all University tutors. Again, this experiment fails in another essential point. Probably no one who ever saw it feels satisfied that his senses can sufficiently or accurately distinguish minute intervals of space or measurements of time, to make him rely upon this for his belief that the spaces vary as the squares of the times. Fortunately it is not necessary to rely on anything so precarious, as this deduction from the two first laws of motion can easily be made by any one who understands the enunciation of these two laws, and is acquainted with the merest elements of algebra.

The other end which this machine is made to serve in treatises of a higher class, is to prove the third law of motion, which we have said it is taken for granted, in mere elementary works, that the reader either understands or receives on the *ipse dixit* of his instructors. Neither is its application in this point of view at all more satisfactory than in that which we have just noticed. It obviously does not prove anything at all, but only exhibits a more or less near approximation to a theory which takes for granted that strings have no weight, friction no existence, the air no effect upon a body in the way of retarding its velocity. And we appeal, with the most undoubting confidence as to what the answer will be, to any fair logical mind, whether this experiment has or ever had any weight in convincing it of the truth implied in the third law of motion, be it worded in what way you will. Is it not absurd on the face of things to adduce this experiment as proof of the law that 'action and reaction are equal and opposite,' or that 'the moving force is proportional to the pressure?' Perhaps it will be said that we are arguing against a mere chimera, and that writers really do not mean that these experiments actually prove the law which they in some sort exhibit. We do not accuse them of any such absurdity, but are only protesting against the ambiguity of expression into which they allow themselves to fall, in treating a subject the difficulties of which to beginners are confessedly so very great. In evidence of the charge which we make, we may refer to Mr. Potter's 'Elementary Treatise on Mechanics for the use of Junior University Students,' and Mr. Pratt's 'Mathematical Principles of Mechanical Philosophy:' the one perhaps amongst the best introductions to the subject which our language possesses; the other the most systematic account of the theory of universal gravitation to be found in a single volume. The expression used by

the former is, 'the law is proved experimentally by Atwood's Machine.' The latter says, 'this is proved by numerous experiments.' This author, we must admit, does supply the antidote to this incorrectness of expression, by observing in another place, that 'these experiments do not *prove* the truth of the law here enunciated . . . the law is only *suggested* by the facts, we have detailed,' &c. We may, however, safely say that the law is not, and never was, suggested by any such facts. In striking contrast with modern English writers stands the beautiful simplicity with which Newton has expressed his meaning in the enunciation of these three laws, with just sufficient instances as will serve to explain the meaning of the terms used, and then proceeding to the corollaries immediately deduced, which seem further to illustrate their meaning to those who may, perhaps, have failed to grasp it from the mere statement of the laws and illustrative examples. Indeed, we believe the '*Principia*' is the only book in the language in which the young mathematician knows, or, at least, may know if he pleases, where he stands, how much he is obliged to assent to, and how much he must for the present take for granted. We do not say that he will not find difficulties; on the contrary, if they do not present themselves sooner, they certainly will begin to appear at the third corollary from the axiom on the laws of motion: but the difficulty here will not arise from any ambiguity on the author's part, but from the learner's having forgotten what is so difficult in such abstractions perpetually to keep in mind, viz. the definitions with which the First Book of the '*Principia*' commences—especially the first two, of 'the quantity of matter,' and the 'quantity of motion.' This difficulty will occur to many even of those who have mastered the first difficulty, which occurs in the very first words of the '*Principia*,' which, without the accompanying explanation, would convey scarcely any idea to the student's mind. They are as follows:—'The quantity of matter is the measure of the same, arising from its density and bulk conjointly.' The very terms are unintelligible till the reader goes on further, and finds this explanation:—'It is this quantity that I mean hereafter everywhere under the name of body or mass.' And even now, to understand its meaning, he has to take for granted what he finds no evidence for, till he gets further in the '*Principia*' than nine-tenths of its readers ever reach, viz. 'that the body or mass is known by the weight of each body, for it is proportional to the weight, as I have found by experiments on pendulums, very accurately made, which shall be shown hereafter.'

The real difficulties of this subject would, we believe, be indefinitely diminished if more attention was paid to the first

section of the 'Principia,' before going on to the second and following sections. As a discipline for the mind in careful reasoning there is nothing in the whole study of physical science at all comparable to this immortal work; and we believe the delay caused in the student's progress by adopting this method instead of the short cut which the analytical method offers towards the same results, would be amply compensated by the greater accuracy of knowledge and powers of mind acquired thereby.

We hope we have said enough on the difficulties of mechanical science, to convince any one that no amount of popular reading will be at all likely to surmount them all, and so to enable the reader to estimate popular science, as it is called, at its proper weight. There is one kind of value which works of this description, if well written, possess, to which we have as yet made no allusion. We believe the principal use which they are calculated to serve, and which, in point of fact, they do serve, is to act the part of handmaids to more exact treatises, to remind the student of the abstract theory of the practical applications which mathematical works can but briefly allude to, and so to fill up those blanks which (every learner of mechanical science will understand us when we say) exist in the mind of the reader who only knows the theoretical investigations, and who, in consequence of their abstract nature, is uncertain how far exactly his comprehension of them goes. We can ourselves remember the case of a young student in mechanics boasting that it was demonstrable that no force could draw a rope into a line accurately horizontal, and being quite puzzled by the simple practical question whether it would first break. He had never contemplated the possibility of the thread snapping, simply because the theory of the composition and resolution of forces to which he had been accustomed demands the hypothetical concession that the string is inextensible and infinitely strong—i.e., incapable of stretching or breaking. His view had been limited to the fact, that there would always be some, though perhaps imperceptible, curvature in the perfectly flexible cord he had been in imagination working upon.

We must not conclude these remarks without adding the masterly view of this subject which appears in the Introduction to Sir John Herschel's 'Outlines of Astronomy.'

'On the other hand, although it is something new to abandon the road of mathematical demonstration in the treatment of subjects susceptible of it, and to teach any considerable branch of science entirely or chiefly by the way of illustration and familiar parallels, it is yet not impossible that those who are already well acquainted with our subject, and whose knowledge has been acquired by that confessedly higher practice which is incompatible with the avowed objects of the present work, may yet find their account in its perusal,—for this reason, that it is always of advantage to present

any given body of knowledge to the mind in as great a variety of different lights as possible. It is a property of illustrations of this kind, to strike no two minds in the same manner, or with the same force; because no two minds are stored with the same images, or have acquired their notions of them by similar habits. Accordingly, it may very well happen, that a proposition, even to one best acquainted with it, may be placed not merely in a new and uncommon, but in a more impressive and satisfactory light by such a course—some obscurity may be dissipated, some inward misgivings cleared up, or even some links supplied which may lead to the perception of connexions and deductions altogether unknown before. And the probability of this is increased when, as in the present instance, the illustrations chosen have not been studiously selected from books, but are such as have presented themselves freely to the author's mind as being most in harmony with his own views; by which, of course, he means to lay no claim to originality in all or any of them beyond what they may really possess.

Besides, there are cases in the application of mechanical principles with which the mathematical student is but too familiar, where, when the data are before him, and the numerical and geometrical relations of his problems all clear to his conception,—when his forces are estimated and his lines measured,—nay, when even he has followed up the application of his technical processes, and fairly arrived at his conclusion,—there is still something wanting in his mind—not in the evidence, for he has examined each link, and finds the chain complete—not in the principles, for those he well knows are too firmly established to be shaken—but precisely in the *mode of action*. He has followed out a train of reasoning by logical and technical rules, but the signs he has employed are not pictures of nature, or have lost their original meaning as such to his mind: he has not seen, as it were, the process of nature passing under his eye in an instant of time, and presented as a consecutive whole to his imagination. A familiar parallel, or an illustration drawn from some artificial or natural process, of which he has that direct and individual impression which gives it a reality and associates it with a name, will, in almost every such case, supply in a moment this deficient feature, will convert all his symbols into real pictures, and infuse an animated meaning into what was before a lifeless succession of words and signs.—*Outlines of Astronomy*, pp. 6, 7.

We should have been glad to transfer the whole of the introduction to this volume to our pages, as it contains so exact a representation not only of the difficulties of the case, but of the proper plan for such a treatise, and the objects which can be attained as well as those which cannot by this style of reading. We must content ourselves with referring to the work itself, which no one will be without who has any pretensions to more than the merest superficial acquaintance with the subject.

We are not afraid of being accused either, on the one hand, of overrating the value of popular works on Astronomy, or, on the other, of making an assertion contradictory to the remarks which we have made on popular treatises in general, when we say that such works as those which we have placed at the head of this article, are absolutely indispensable both to the mathematical student and to the man who would acquire such a knowledge of Astronomy as can be gained by one who is not familiar

with the notation of algebra, or the figures and demonstrations of geometry. The use of such a volume to the mathematician is exhibited in the strongest light, by referring to any strictly mathematical treatise on Plane Astronomy that has been published during this century. There is scarcely one that is without its introductory chapter, the object of which is to give a rough view of the outlines of the subject, and to render the subsequent mathematical investigations more interesting and intelligible. Even in the edition of 'Maddy's Astronomy,' as published by Hymers—which professedly confines itself as much as possible to the mathematical theory, and is evidently written much more with the view of enabling students to answer questions at examinations, than to put them in possession of a real knowledge of the science—the Introduction forms a prominent feature of the work, and occupies more than the fourth part of its bulk. In other treatises of a more philosophical caste, such as the elegant work of Professor Woodhouse, the part that is generally consigned to the introduction, is judiciously mixed up with the mathematical investigations; and this, perhaps, is still the best treatise in our language for enabling the student to obtain a complete view of Astronomy. It would, indeed, be useless to recommend its perusal to young students at our Universities. Pupils, as well as tutors, would exclaim against it, as they cannot afford to sacrifice time which must be spent in acquiring what will tell in the examination. It is, then, in filling up the gaps that are left, by purely mathematical treatises, that such works as those by Sir John Herschel and M. Arago have their principal value.

But, again, the science of Astronomy differs from most other physical sciences in this particular, that it admits of being studied both agreeably and profitably by those who never will have the power, or, if they had the power, never would have the inclination, to carry their investigations far into its depths. What may be called a superficial knowledge of it, has not the disadvantages under which a superficial knowledge of almost any other science lies. In the first place, there is here little danger of the learner materially overrating the amount of his knowledge. Of the immense amount of distinct facts which Astronomy presents—whatever number of them he is conversant with—whether he has only reached so far as to distinguish accurately between the earth's diurnal motion of rotation on her axis, and her translation through space in her annual orbit round the sun; or whether he has been enabled to comprehend, in some sense, the steps by which the periodic times of the double stars have been ascertained; his knowledge is always, so to say, visibly lying close beside his ignorance. Suppose him

to be where you will, his knowledge depends upon testimony, and he knows that he cannot prove for himself what he, nevertheless, knows others have proved, though he has more or less insight into the methods of proof which have been used. Again, as he proceeds he is ever reminded of the incompleteness of knowledge he has as yet attained. At each step which he takes in advance, he is reminded that the mode of expression of the last was but a condescension to his inability to understand the whole truth. Correction after correction has to be applied. The effects of refraction, parallax aberration, &c., all admit of being explained independently of each other; and each, as it comes before him, convinces him of the imperfection of his past knowledge of the subject, and significantly points out the incompleteness of his present acquaintance with the results of observation. And this is one reason why we are inclined to give a hearty welcome to popular books on Astronomy. The proverb that 'a little knowledge is a dangerous thing,' scarcely applies to this subject, because, as we have said, the reader cannot turn his eyes in any direction without being convinced not only of the immense amount of truth that he does not know, but also of the impossibility under which he lies of proving for himself what he does comprehend. It is on this ground that we think such works may be made to serve a useful purpose in the way of education and discipline, regarded as distinct from the value of the instruction imparted by them. However, apart from this, there is real and available value for most situations in life in even the most elementary acquaintance with Astronomy; and, perhaps, there is no other subject so full of interest from the first commencement of its study, down to the extreme limit which the capacity of the learner enables him to reach. The mere knowledge of the position of the sun, or of the face of the heavens, has often proved useful in ascertaining the time or the direction of a traveller's route; and even an amateur observer, totally unacquainted with Physical Astronomy, may add materially to the known facts of the science. Mathematicians have themselves made the division of the science into Plane and Physical: the former occupied principally with phenomena; the latter, with the mathematical investigation of their physical causes; and a very accurate acquaintance with one of these branches of the science, may be possessed by one who has no acquaintance with the calculus necessary for the calculation of Planetary Perturbations, nor even sufficient knowledge of mathematics to be able to demonstrate Kepler's laws. We believe we might mention the name of more than one great observer who possesses but a slender acquaintance with the higher branches of mathematics. Now, though the man who understands only

Plane Astronomy may be said to possess but a superficial acquaintance with the science as compared with the mathematician, who can follow the demonstrations in the *Mecanique Celeste*; and yet his knowledge, so far from being contemptible, may be of the highest advantage to others as well as of the highest interest to himself; so it is with the still more superficial knowledge of him who attacks the subject, furnished only with the arms of a slight acquaintance with the principles of algebra and geometry, plane and spherical trigonometry. Such a person may safely and profitably go a certain way, and how far he can reach will depend partly upon the accuracy and extent of his preliminary information, and partly upon his capacity—more especially his power of giving his undivided attention to any given subject. Nay, to go still lower down in the scale of intellect, it may be possible to gain some useful knowledge of the subject, with only so much previous acquaintance with it as M. Arago presupposes in his hearers—and that is absolutely nothing. His introductory address concludes with the expression of the wish that the audience should be composed in greater part, even altogether, of persons entirely unacquainted with mathematical studies.

It is hardly possible to imagine a greater contrast than appears in the two volumes, the titles of which we have placed at the head of this article, when it is remembered that they profess to treat of the same subject and adopt somewhat the same style of teaching. We say somewhat of the same style, because it would not be fair to represent them as written with precisely the same objects in view or for exactly the same class of persons. The very titles of the works distinguish them; one is in the strictest sense '*Popular Astronomy*,' and professes to address itself to a much larger class than the other, and one much lower in the scale of intellect; whilst the '*Outlines*' are addressed to all who understand the subject, as well as those who towards its comprehension can bring a moderate acquaintance with mathematical science.

In saying that Sir John Herschel's work answers the purpose for which it was intended, and that M. Arago's does not, we do not mean to contrast the two works further at present; or in any way to disparage the latter work, which we think fails to do what it professes only because it professes what is impossible, viz., to carry an unmathematical reader over the whole ground of modern Astronomy. On the great value of the work in another respect we shall have something to say presently.

The '*Outlines*' consist of an expansion of a treatise written more than twenty years ago for the '*Cabinet Cyclopædia*.' In its original form, it was, perhaps, the most popular as well as the most useful of all the publications of that series; as it at pre-

sent appears, it is perhaps the most complete and the most philosophical work which has yet been written. It still retains the character of a *work of explanation*; the principal changes being in the part which treats of sidereal and nebular Astronomy, the subjects of which are brought up to the level of our present knowledge, and in that part which relates to the Lunar and Planetary Perturbations. It is no slight proof of the intrinsic value of so large and expensive a book on such a difficult subject, that the preface to the first edition is dated April, 1849, and the note appended to the fourth, August, 1851. The author sets out with the demand for a much greater amount of previous cultivation of mind than M. Arago, and frankly confesses that he makes a further demand on those who would understand the abstruser parts of the subject. Speaking on the subject of Perturbations, he says that the subject cannot be made *elementary* in the sense in which that word is understood in these days of light reading. The chapters devoted to it must, therefore, be considered as addressed to a class of readers in possession of somewhat more mathematical knowledge than those who will find the rest of the work readily and easily accessible; to readers desirous of preparing themselves by the possession of a sort of *carte du pays*, for a campaign in the most difficult, but at the same time the most attractive and the most remunerative, of all the applications of modern geometry.

It is in this power of understanding his readers, his ability to change places with them as it were, that Sir John Herschel stands pre-eminent amongst astronomers. It is a rare gift seldom seen, except in the men who are deepest in their respective subjects, and we are inclined to think but rarely found in them, unless they have risen to eminence almost by their own unassisted efforts. This distinguished astronomer cannot be quoted as an instance in point here. Probably few mathematicians have entered upon their field of labour with greater advantages, but we cannot refrain from here offering our humble tribute of admiration for his extraordinary powers of mind as exhibited not only in this volume, but in his other great works, as well as for the unwearied perseverance which has enabled him to enrich this science with so large a number of facts derived from observation. Any one who will take the trouble to read the work through, and to master its details, will find that explanations occur just where they are wanted; that scarcely anything remains to be added to make the theory of the subject intelligible. Whenever he feels inclined to think that an illustration would have cleared up a given point, or that the subject has not been sufficiently enlarged upon, he will find by reading on that the fuller explanation or illustration is made to his hand; and

thus a very difficult subject has been made as accessible almost as it is possible to conceive to a class of readers possessing the *minimum* of intellectual qualifications for such a study. The style, too, is lucid and perspicuous, and the book possesses the additional merit, and no mean merit it is, that the author scarcely ever alludes to himself or his own discoveries. There is only one point that we dislike in the whole volume, viz., that the author has printed Greek words without either accents or breathings. This is a fault which we have noticed in many of the publications of Messrs. Longman, and we must express our surprise that so great a disfigurement should be allowed to remain, which could be removed by so small an amount of trouble. Again, let us not forget to notice the religious tone, as well as the calm and philosophical spirit, which pervades the book. It would be impossible to quote passages in evidence of this, for the author nowhere affects the philosophical, and does not appear by any means anxious to screw his subject into the service of natural theology. Yet the passages at the beginning of the eighth chapter, and in the ninth at p. 311, remind us of the author who, near thirty years ago, observed at the commencement of his treatise on Physical Astronomy in the 'Encyclopædia Metropolitana,' that—

'Secrets which an angel might penetrate at a glance, become revealed to man by the slow yet sure effects of persevering thought. The progress of modern science has done more than the keenest metaphysical reasoning, and has given us the most convincing proofs of the agency of one general and intelligent cause throughout the whole system of nature. When we see on all sides phenomena grouping themselves under laws intelligible and simply expressed, which are themselves subordinate to others yet more simple and extensive; when we see every anomaly which threatened destruction to a theory becoming, in the progress of our knowledge, its firmest support; every inequality disappearing when viewed from a higher level; every exception proving a rule of greater generality; all, in short, conveying more and more towards order and simplicity the more severely we scrutinize it,—it is impossible not to allow that that last great step which unites all the phenomena of the universe under one general head, and refers them to one all-pervading agency—however inconceivably remote, and surpassing probably the utmost limits of the human intellect to comprehend, if explained,—would still be but the continuation and final completion of a chain of reasoning whose first links we hold within our grasp—the consummation of a process actually begun—the termination of a course into which we are fairly entered.'

It would be almost impossible by any number of extracts to give the reader an adequate idea of this work, which, to be estimated properly, must be viewed as a whole; but before we go on to notice more at large M. Arago's interesting treatise, we will give, abridged from it, an account of the most extraordinary piece of additional evidence in favour of the Newtonian law of gravitation which this century has produced,—we mean

the prediction that the planet Neptune ought to be, where in point of fact it was afterwards found. Before commencing this account, it is proper to observe, that the author has not been unmindful of the changes that continued observations are making in the amount of our knowledge of astronomical facts. Upon a cursory comparison of this edition with the first, the reader would pronounce that it was but an additional issue, the types of the first not having been broken up, for nearly throughout they correspond exactly, with the exception of the corrections in the latter, the pages in both editions beginning and ending with the same words. Indeed, from the note at page 275, there can be no doubt that this is the case, and the alterations have always been compressed into the same space which the passages for which they have been substituted occupied. The author, however, informs us in a note to the fourth edition, that—

‘Several alterations and additions are made in this Edition, besides what have been introduced into the Third, to bring it up to the actual state of astronomical discovery. The elements of four new planets (Parthenope, Egeria, Victoria, and Irene) have been added, and improved elements of Iris, Metis, Hebe, and Hygeia, substituted for the provisional elements before given. The remarkable discovery of an additional ring of Saturn, and the curious researches of M. Peters on the proper motion of Sirius, with several minor features, are noticed.’

The alteration in the description of Saturn's rings, affords a fair specimen of the author's cautious mode of speaking of phenomena, whose existence is suspected, though not yet ascertained. We regret that in this case the change involves the loss of a very pretty passage, as well as a remark which indicates that tone of mind in the writer to which we have referred above.

In the first edition, the conclusion of the account of this phenomena runs as follows:—

‘Several astronomers have suspected, and even consider themselves to have certainly observed, the rings of Saturn to be occasionally at least streaked with numerous dark lines, parallel to the decided black interval which separates the two rings, and which, being permanent, and being seen equally, and in the same part of the breadth in both sides of the ring, cannot be doubted to be a real separation. As it is equally certain, however, that the ring of Saturn has been admirably well seen by others with telescopes noway inferior, without giving rise to any suspicion of such a subdivision, the *permanence* of such streaks must at least be considered as undemonstrated, and the phenomenon remanded to the careful attention of observers. The rings of Saturn must present a magnificent spectacle from those regions of the planet which lie above their enlightened sides, as vast arches spanning the sky from horizon to horizon, and holding an almost invariable situation among the stars. On the other hand, in the region beneath the dark side, a solar eclipse of fifteen years in duration under their shadow must afford (to our ideas) an inhospitable asylum to animated beings, ill compensated by the faint light of the satellites. But we shall do wrong to

judge of the fitness or unfitness of their condition from what we see around us, when, perhaps, the very combinations which convey to our minds only images of horrors, may be in reality theatres of the most striking and glorious displays of magnificent continuance.

In the place of this passage we have substituted, in the edition of 1851, the following:—

‘The exterior ring of Saturn is described by many observers as rather less luminous than the interior, and the inner portion of this latter than its outer. On the night of Nov. 11, 1850, however, Mr. G. B. Bond, of the Harvard Observatory (Cambridge, U. S.), using the great Fraunhofer equatorial of that institution, became aware of a line of demarcation between these two portions so definite, and an extension inwards of the dusky border to such an extent (one-fifth, *by measurement*, of the joint breadth of the two old rings), as to justify him in considering it as a newly-discovered ring. On the nights of the 25th and 29th of the same month, and without knowledge of Mr. Bond’s observations, Mr. Dawes, at his observatory at Wateringbury, by the aid of an exquisite achromatic by Merz, of 6½ inches aperture, observed the very same fact, and even more distinctly, so as to be sure of a decidedly darker interval between the old and new rings, and even to subdivide the latter into two of unequal degrees of obscurity, separated by a line more obscure than either.’

‘Dr. Galle, of Berlin, however, would appear to have been the first to notice (June 10, 1838) a faint extension of the inner ring towards the body of the planet, to about half the interval between the then recognised inner ring and the body, *as shown by micrometrical measures*. But this result remained unpublished (or at least not generally known) until after the observations of Messrs. Bond and Dawes. The most remarkable feature of this singular discovery is, that subsequent observations, from many quarters, have concurred in showing the new ring to consist of *semi-transparent materials through which the limb of the planet may be seen up to the edge of the interior bright ring*. Dark lines (apparently of a transitory nature) have been observed on the bright rings parallel to the permanent dark interval dividing them, and appear to indicate a fluid (possibly a vaporous) constitution of these wonderful appendages.’—*Outlines of Astronomy*, pp. 321, 322.

We now proceed to the account of the discovery of Neptune.

The problem of ‘Three Bodies,’ as it is called, is well known to mathematicians for its great difficulty. Not only does it imply a knowledge of the higher parts of analysis merely to comprehend its method, but the computations involve an immense amount of laborious calculation. Few, comparatively, have taken the trouble to wade far into its depths, though some portion of the subject is indispensable for acquiring the highest honours at our Universities.

Its object is to calculate the amount of disturbance produced in the motion of a secondary in its orbit round its primary by the action of a third body. One method of calculation has been successfully applied to determine the moon’s place regarded as a satellite moving round the earth, and deflected from her path by the

attraction of the sun, which in this case represents the third body. It has been found necessary to adopt a different method for the case of a planet moving round the sun and disturbed by another planet. Both these methods have been successful, when combined with, and corrected by, a considerable number of observations, in enabling astronomers to construct tables which predict almost to perfect accuracy the places of the moon and the planets for any given moment of time for many years to come. Thus, when a new planet is discovered, a provisional orbit is obtained for it, and the corrections which determine its exact place and the true elements of its orbit are afterwards applied. But whatever may be the difficulty of this problem, the reader, without any acquaintance with mathematical science, will easily be able to comprehend how much more difficult is the inverse problem of Perturbations. It may be stated thus, as Sir John Herschel has given it:—‘Given the disturbances to find the orbit, and place in that orbit, of the disturbing planet.’ Not one of the elements of the orbit of the disturbing body is in this case known—the planet itself is simply hypothetical—and the problem is, to ascertain, on the supposition that a certain derangement in the motion of a known planet is due to the attraction of an exterior planet, where this latter body ought to be. And this was the process which actually led to the discovery of the new planet Neptune. All the other planets owe their discovery to accident—if that can be called accident which is the natural fruit of continued observation. This alone was discovered by theory. Of the seven planets which, with the earth and the smaller fragments of planets, which have been discovered in the present century, form what is called the Solar System, five have been known from remote antiquity. The sixth, now called Uranus, was discovered by Sir William Herschel, in 1781. All these, even including the last, when sought under favourable circumstances, are sometimes visible to the naked eye. Soon after its discovery its orbit was calculated and marked out with tolerable accuracy; and upon the calculation being carried backwards, it was discovered that the planet had actually been seen by different observers about twenty times during the eighteenth century without the smallest suspicion of its planetary nature. These recorded observations served still further to correct the theory, and ‘it was reasonably hoped and expected that by making use of the data thus afforded, and duly allowing for the perturbations produced since 1690, by Saturn, Jupiter, and the inferior planets, elliptic elements would be obtained, which, taken in conjunction with these perturbations, would represent not only all the observations up to the time of executing the calculations, but also all future observations, in as satisfactory a manner as

'those of any of the other planets are actually represented. 'This expectation, however, proved delusive.' From 1795 to 1822 the true place of Uranus was in advance of the calculated. This discrepancy, after reaching a maximum, began to diminish till about the year 1830, when the observed and calculated longitudes agreed, and after this date the planet fell behind its calculated place. After calculating and making due allowance for errors in the supposed elements of the orbit of Uranus, which have been assumed as the basis of calculation, there remained a residuum of difference between theory and observation, which indicated some extraneous cause which had not yet been taken into consideration. This cause appears to have come into action with sufficient power to manifest itself about the year 1804, and its action began to be reversed in 1822, and to operate more energetically than before.

The problem of ascertaining this cause was worked out by two mathematicians independently, and the longitudes assigned to the supposed planet for a given day by the two calculators were nearly within three degrees of each other. The French astronomer was fortunate enough to be the direct cause of its discovery by writing to point out to Dr. Galle, of the Royal Observatory at Berlin, where to look for it; which accordingly he did, and found it between the two places indicated by the two calculations, about a degree nearer the French than the English place. Perhaps there are few discoveries in which good fortune has not had some part. Its share in the present instance is exhibited in the guess which these astronomers were enabled to make as to the distance of the disturbing planet from the sun. There is a curious law known by the name of Bode's Law, which is in point of fact nothing more than an empirical statement of facts, viz., that each superior planet is double the distance of the next inferior planetary body from Mercury. This was simply a statement of the results of observation, and there was no theory proposed to account for it—and the distance at which Neptune is now known to be from the sun entirely breaks down the statement of the law—yet it was on the assumption of the truth of this law that both discoverers proceeded in their investigations. Both took for granted that the major axis of Neptune's orbit was 38 times that of the earth's mean distance from the sun. Both in the course of their investigations were compelled to reduce the value of the assumed distance—the one to 36, the other to 37—until at last Mr. Adams came to the conclusion that the mean distance of 33 would probably nearly satisfy all the observations. Subsequent calculations gave the still further diminished result of 30. In other respects the elements which they assign to the planet's orbit differ very widely

from the elements which have since its discovery been calculated for it. From these elements, as laid down by Professor Walker of the Washington Observatory, it was ascertained that Lalande had seen Neptune on the 8th and 10th May, 1795, and thus it became possible to determine the elements with still greater precision. The planet appears to be attended by a satellite, which has enabled Professor Peirce, of Cambridge, U. S., to compute its mass. And here the difference between the results is so great that, taking into consideration the other discrepancies, he 'pronounces it impossible so to extend fairly the limits of Leverrier's analysis as to embrace the planet Neptune; and that although its mass, as determined from the elongation of its satellite, renders it possible to account for all the perturbations of Uranus by its action in the most surprising manner, yet in the opinion of Professor Peirce it is not the planet to which geometrical analysis directed the telescope.' We will conclude this part of the subject with the remarks of Sir John Herschel:—

'Posterity will hardly credit that, with a full knowledge of all the circumstances attending this great discovery—of the calculations of Leverrier and Adams—of the communication of its predicted place to Dr. Galle—and of the new planet being actually found by him in that place, in the remarkable manner above commemorated; not only have doubts been expressed as to the validity of the calculations of those geometers, and the legitimacy of their conclusions, but these doubts have been carried so far as to lead the objectors to attribute the acknowledged fact of a planet previously unknown occupying that precise place in the heavens at that precise time, to sheer accident!'¹ What share accident may have had in the successful issue of the calculations, we presume the reader, after what has

¹ 'These doubts seem to have originated partly in the great disagreement between the predicted and real elements of Neptune, partly in the near (*possibly* precise) commensurability of the mean motions of Neptune and Uranus. We conceive them, however, to be founded in a total misconception of the nature of the problem, which was not, from such obviously uncertain indications as the observed discordances could give, to determine as astronomical quantities the axis, eccentricity, and mass of the disturbing planet; but practically to discover where to look for it: when, if once found, these elements would be far better ascertained. To do this, *any axis, eccentricity, perihelion, and mass, however wide of the truth*, which would represent, even roughly, the amount, but *with tolerable correctness the direction*, of the disturbing force during the very moderate interval when the departures from theory were really considerable, would equally serve their purposes; and with an eccentricity, mass, and perihelion disposable, it is obvious that any assumption of the axis between the limits 30 and 38, nay, even with a much wider inferior limit, would serve the purpose. In his attempt to assign an inferior limit to the axis, and in the value so assigned, M. Leverrier, it must be admitted, was not successful. Mr. Adams, on the other hand, influenced by no considerations of the kind which appear to have weighed with his brother geometer, fixed ultimately (as we have seen) on an axis not very egregiously wrong. Still it were to be wished, for the satisfaction of all parties, that some one would undertake the problem *de novo*, employing formulæ not liable to the passage through infinity, which, technically speaking, hampers, or may be supposed to hamper, the continuous application of the usual perturbational formulæ when cases of commensurability occur.'

been said, will have little difficulty in satisfying himself. As regards the time when the discovery was made, much has also been attributed to fortunate coincidence. The following considerations will, we apprehend, completely dissipate this idea, if still lingering in the mind of any one at all conversant with the subject. The period of Uranus being 84·0140 years, and that of Neptune 164·6181, their synodic revolution (art. 418.), or the interval between two successive conjunctions, is 171·58 years. The late conjunction having taken place about the beginning of 1822, that next preceding must have happened in 1649, or more than 40 years before the first recorded observation of Uranus in 1690, to say nothing of its discovery as a planet. In 1690, then, it must have been effectually out of reach of any perturbative influence worth considering, and so it remained during the whole interval from thence to 1800. From that time the effect of perturbation began to become sensible, about 1805 prominent, and in 1820 had nearly reached its maximum. At this epoch an alarm was sounded. The maximum was not attained,—the event, so important to astronomy, was still in progress of development,—when the fact (anything rather than a striking one) was noticed, and made matter of complaint. But the time for discussing its cause with any prospect of success was not yet come. Everything turns upon the precise determination of the epoch of the maximum, when the perturbing and perturbed planet were in conjunction, and upon the law of increase and diminution of the perturbation itself on either side of that point. Now it is always difficult to assign the time of the occurrence of a maximum by observations liable to errors bearing a ratio far from inconsiderable to the whole quantity observed. Until the lapse of some years from 1822 it would have been impossible to have fixed that epoch with any certainty; and as respects the law of degradation and total arc of longitude over which the sensible perturbations extend, we are hardly yet arrived at a period when this can be said to be completely determinable from observation alone. In all this we see nothing of accident, unless it be accidental that an event which must have happened between 1781 and 1953, actually happened in 1822; and that we live in an age when astronomy has reached that perfection, and its cultivators exercise that vigilance which neither permit such an event, nor its scientific importance, to pass unnoticed. The blossom had been watched with interest in its development, and the fruit was gathered in the very moment of maturity.¹—*Outlines of Astronomy*, pp. 516—518.

We have already said that the two works which form the subject of this article present a singular contrast in many points of view. Their difference of plan does not in fairness allow of their being compared in the same manner as would have been allowable if their object had been the same. But we may be

¹ 'The student who may wish to see the perturbations of Uranus produced by Neptune, as computed from a knowledge of the elements and mass of that planet, such as we now know to be pretty near the truth, will find them stated at length from the calculations of Mr. Walker (of Washington, U. S.), in the "Proceedings of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences," vol. i. p. 334, *et seq.* On examining the comparisons of the results of Mr. Walker's formulæ with those of Mr. Adams' theory in p. 342, he will perhaps be surprised at the enormous difference between the actions of Neptune and Mr. Adams' "hypothetical planet" on the longitude of Uranus. This is easily explained. Mr. Adams' perturbations are deviations from Bouvard's orbit of Uranus, as it stood immediately previous to the late conjunction. Mr. Walker's are the deviations from a mean or undisturbed orbit freed from the influence of the long inequality resulting from the near commensurability of the motions.'

permitted to say that the French astronomer's work has some very marked defects; and as this is the least pleasant part of the task we have assigned ourselves, we will dismiss it in as few words as possible. In the first place we must notice a grave fault for which the author certainly cannot be made responsible. The work is very badly translated. Every here and there, there are obscurities of expression arising wholly from the neglect on the part of the translators to notice the difference between the idioms of the two languages; and in other cases where there is no danger of misconceiving the author's meaning, there are sentences which run strangely awkward to an English ear. This is the more to be regretted because, as the editors have observed in their advertisement, 'it would be difficult to explain the 'truths of Astronomy in popular language with more convincing 'force of logic, or in a more lucid, concise, and unaffected style 'than the author has done in the present work.' That the reader may not suppose that we are making a charge without the power of substantiating it, we give the following instances, selected from a large number of similar expressions, in which the idiom of the original language is allowed to peep through the translation.

In the Preface, p. xiv.:—

'It is not I who would consent to degrade . . . a science respecting which it has been justly said, that it affords the true measure of the strength of the human intellect.'

At p. 191—

'It will no longer happen that an astronomer may hear the same hour struck by different clocks during a whole half-hour, as Delambre stated to me to have remarked several times.'

Again, at p. 222:—

'The Book of Job . . . ascends at least to the year of the death of Moses.'

There can be no reason why in such a treatise as this we should be continually reminded of the original language in such expressions as—'This branch of astronomy is the fruit of *yesterday's* research' (p. 303); or why we should perpetually meet with such very bad grammar as the following: 'In others we might *imagine to see* the head of a comet with its nucleus.' These expressions, it must be remembered, are not solitary, but give a fair specimen of the mode in which the whole volume has been translated. We could fill many pages with extracts in which similar blemishes would appear. We might add that there are instances of carelessness in which the omission or addition of a single particle entirely alters the meaning of the whole sentence (see pp. 190 and 221); but these, though apparently errors of the translator and not of the printer, will admit of being added

to the short list of former errata which has been prefixed to this volume, upon the appearance of the second and concluding volume.

Again, it may fairly be expected of a book which is evidently intended for the perusal of gentlemen and scholars that mistakes of scholarship should not be so abundant as they are in this volume. Surely proper names of Greek or Latin authors ought to be spelt correctly. We do not expect to find such novelties as Timeus (p. 481), and Sozomenes (p. 557), in a book of such pretensions as this; and, after making all due allowance for printers not being accustomed to Greek type, we can scarcely reconcile ourselves to seven misprints in five Greek words which occur in a single paragraph (p. 56). We have not examined the book carefully with any view to the detection of misprints, but several which we have discovered—such as Vindematrix (p. 202), Atair (p. 232), &c., &c.—lead to the supposition that there may be others, particularly in the catalogues of the elements of the asteroids and comets.

With regard to the execution of the work itself, the principal fault which occurs to us is its want of unity and regularity. It is in this respect most strikingly contrasted with the 'Outlines,' where everything is in its proper place, and where the reader may proceed from the beginning to the end without meeting with anything to obstruct his progress except his own deficiency in that knowledge which the author sets out with requiring from him. It is true, perhaps, that most of his readers will omit the second of the four parts into which the work is divided, and which treats of the Lunar and Planetary Perturbations; but this will not be the result of any deficiency in the writer, but will be simply owing to the incapacity of the reader, or his unwillingness to give to the subject all the amount of attention which it requires. In M. Arago's work, on the contrary, will be found a series of subjects more or less distinct, and which may be read independently of each other, and in almost any order which the reader chooses to adopt. This was, perhaps, scarcely avoidable in a work which professes to be a reproduction of a course of lectures delivered during eighteen consecutive years; but it is unfortunate that his grouping of the separate subjects of the nineteen books into which this volume is divided does not admit of its being read straight through without reference to subsequent parts of the treatise, even in order to secure that amount of comprehension of the subject which the author guarantees to his attentive auditor or reader. To give but one instance of this, we notice that in the interesting book which treats of multiple stars, most of the latter half is occupied with the determination of the relative motions of double stars and

that of their masses, on the hypothesis of their distances being known, implying that the reader understands not only Kepler's laws of elliptic motion, but Newton's theory of gravitation; and yet we believe we are correct in stating that Kepler's laws have only once before been cursorily alluded to, whilst, for all that appears in M. Arago's volume, the reader may be profoundly ignorant of the name of Newton, and of his great discovery of the principle of universal gravitation. The explanation of the former is not given till we arrive at the sixteenth book, and for the account of the latter we have to wait till the appearance of the second volume.

Another anticipation which occurs in the same chapter is of less importance; still it is to be regretted that the author should have implied the theory of aberration, as dependent upon the transmission of light through space with a certain velocity, before he has given any account of that theory. All these and other similar transpositions seem to arise from the author having inverted the usual order observed in books of Astronomy. The same observation applies to the author's acknowledgment of his inability to explain in that place (p. 524) how it is that three observations of a comet suffice to determine its parabolic orbit. The whole theory of comets, of multiple stars, and nebulae, should, we think, have been reserved to the conclusion of the treatise.

We will conclude the ungrateful task of picking holes in our author with noticing another peculiarity in which he is most disadvantageously contrasted with Sir John Herschel—we mean the tone that pervades the book. We noticed that there was no display of the bearings of his subject upon Natural Theology in the 'Outlines,' neither is there any definite attempt to deny the unity or personality of the Divine Author of Creation in the 'Popular Astronomy;' yet the perusal of the two books gives the reader a very different impression of the tone of mind of the two writers. We do not object to the absurd conjectures of writers on science being treated with the ridicule which, if they are wholly unfounded, they may perhaps deserve; but M. Arago's remarks have a somewhat flippant appearance when he alludes to mistakes which have any connexion with the religious view of the subject.

In objecting to what he calls the famous *cui bono* argument, he is by no means careful to guard his remarks from the suspicion that they are directed against the whole doctrine of what are called *final causes* (p. 316); and there is nothing so extremely absurd in Derham's inquiring whether 'there was not beyond the sphere of the most distant stars, a region entirely luminous,' as to call for the sneering quotation from Voltaire, which the

author has inserted, much less to justify him in pronouncing that Voltaire knew everything, when M. Arago must have been perfectly aware that the celebrated infidel had not mathematical knowledge to enable him to read and understand the 'Principia' (p. 332). We do not like the remarks which he has made (p. 304) on the law of gravitation being an inherent property of matter; which may possibly be true, but certainly is as far from being proved true as it was in Newton's time, in spite of the immensely extended sphere in which it is now (thanks to recent observations of the movements of double stars) tolerably well ascertained to operate.

Again, when proposing the question whether the number of the stars is infinite, we should have been glad to see the difficulty solved in the only way in which it admits of solution—by showing the contradiction in idea involved in creation being infinite. The author, however, seems by no means anxious to take for granted that there is One Intelligent Mind which created the universe. The two chapters in which this discussion occurs are the most misty in the book, and the author is guilty of an egregious fallacy, which, however it may deceive unlearned readers, is very transparent to any person conversant with the laws of infinite series.

'If the universe of stars is infinite, as everything leads us to suppose, there is not a single visual line extending from the earth to the regions of space which does not encounter some one of those bodies. However minute their superficial dimensions may be, the stars will produce, by their continuity, the aspect of a luminous envelope without any obscure part. The interval included between two constituent stars of this sphere, placed at a certain distance, would be sometimes filled up by a star situate at an infinitely greater distance; but this does not prevent the phenomena of brightness from being the same as if all the stars were attached to a spherical vault, and were consequently at the same distance from the observer. The brightness of this vault would be everywhere the same, if all the component stars had the same intrinsic brightness. Assuming this brightness to be equal to that of the sun,—a supposition natural enough, since the sun is undoubtedly a star,—each individual region of the heavens of an apparent amplitude of about 321 would transmit to us a quantity of light equal to that which comes from the sun. The reality presents itself to us under a very different aspect. How are we to explain everything without renouncing the idea of a distribution of stars throughout the whole extent of infinite space?'—*Popular Astronomy*, vol. i. p. 247.

The fallacy consists in the assumption that an infinite number of points must of necessity fill up a given superficial area; when it is obvious that any part of that superficial area contains an infinite number of points. This point admits of being illustrated by taking the extreme case of a number of bodies placed one behind another in a straight line from the spectator's eye. In theory this number might be absolutely infinite, yet

would have no tendency to fill up the apparent interval between two observed stars.

With all the drawbacks to which we have alluded, M. Arago's volume is a delightful book; and we may gain some notion of the interest with which the original course of lectures was listened to, from the pleasure with which it will be read, under the disadvantages both of arrangement and translation which have been noticed. It forms the second volume of a proposed translation of all the principal works of the author. The first volume of the series appeared last year, and was translated under the superintendence of Colonel Sabine. Other portions are advertised to appear from the pen of Professor Powell. The order in which these volumes issue from the press is much to be regretted; for the first, which contains the Meteorological Essays, is perhaps the least interesting portion of our author's works; but it gives a favourable specimen of M. Arago's power of accommodating himself to the lowest capacity, and the least conceivable amount of information in his readers. It cannot be expected that this part of his works will be interesting to general readers; but on the subject of thunder and lightning, which is the first of the subjects treated in this volume, it contains every piece of information that could be collected. The writer has ransacked classical literature and mediæval works, and has put together from diaries and journals, and casual remarks in books now almost forgotten, everything that could throw any light upon the matter. Private letters from various correspondents contribute their quota of information, and the beginner in science may learn a useful lesson from the trouble which this great observer has taken in chronicling apparently unimportant facts. In fact, the very value of the book detracts materially from its interest; a theory, with a few facts to bear it out, affords much more agreeable reading than an impartial account of everything that has fallen under the writer's notice, when there is no theory for the facts either to confirm or disprove. However, we do not purpose to allude to this volume any further than as it may serve to illustrate the qualities of mind which the author brought to bear upon physical investigations. We shall, therefore, content ourselves with extracting from the Introduction a short account of this extraordinary man, as given by his friend Humboldt, omitting all allusion to a subject from which Humboldt himself seems unable to refrain, his own life and adventures.

M. Arago early came under the notice of Laplace, upon whose recommendation the Bureau des Longitudes had chosen him to assist M. Biot in measuring the arc of the meridian. He had also been favourably spoken of by Lagrange, a writer whose

praise is valuable, because he was in general very sparing in bestowing it. Lagrange appears to have frequently spoken of him as a young man of extraordinary promise, and that principally on the ground of the faculty which he possessed of fixing on the important points of a problem; it was this faculty which enabled him so well to point out the path in which other observers and calculators might but follow up investigations which had been left incomplete. In September, 1809, when only twenty-three years of age, he was chosen by forty-seven out of fifty-two votes to succeed Lalande as a Member of the Academy of Sciences. He had before this distinguished himself not only in Geodesical Investigations, but by several discoveries in Physical Optics. And here we are glad to be able to record the fact that 'Smith's Optics' was one of the first books the perusal of which gave him a predilection for the study of light. The subject of refraction, the paths of luminous rays, and the causes which alter their velocity, was his favourite pursuit. And we take this opportunity of recommending this work to all who would gain a thorough knowledge of the subject, so far as it was known at the time when it was published. It was more than half a century old, and therefore would have been spoken of as an old-fashioned work when M. Arago read it, yet another fifty years have passed without producing a book which is a fit substitute for it. The merest elementary works on the subject recently published, will indeed be found to contain a great deal which this work does not; but there is none so calculated to give the learner an interest in optics as this apparently cumbersome quarto volume, adapted, as it is, to all classes of readers, and containing, in fact, four treatises, one popular, and the others mathematical, mechanical, and philosophical. Our recommendation does not extend to the mathematical treatise, the methods of which are too tedious to be adopted in the present state of science; but the other three parts contain information which we should be at a loss to find in any other work of the present day.

The writer of the Introduction to his works appears to think that the nature of M. Arago's employment during the three years occupied by him in the Trigonometrical Survey, directed his attention to the phenomena of Meteorological Optics. To this period of his life he traces his fondness for investigating the laws which regulate the perpetual variations of the colour of the sea, the intensity of reflected light on the surface of clouds, and the play of atmospheric refractions. The great discoveries of M. Arago range over a period of about ten years, from 1811 to 1821. His experiments and investigations were continued for many years later. His last great effort he was enabled him-

self to complete. Mr. Wheatstone's experiments for ascertaining the duration of the electric spark, by rotation, suggested to him the principle of a similar experiment, which he projected in 1838, for measuring the difference of the velocity of light in a liquid and in air. In 1850, when everything was prepared, M. Arago's sight quite failed; and in a note presented to the Institute, he observed that his pretensions must be limited to having propounded the problem, and publicly proposed certain means for its resolution, adding, that with his defect of sight, he could only accompany with best wishes the experimentalists who should be willing to follow out his ideas, and thus add fresh evidence in favour of the undulatory theory to those which he had himself deduced from the phenomena of interference. This was the conclusion of his optical researches, which had extended over a period of more than forty years. The subjects of magnetism and electricity occupied much less of his attention, though these sciences are considerably indebted to him.

Baron Humboldt enumerates the labours and discoveries of his illustrious friend under six heads, the first of which, which he calls the literary and biographical part, we may soon expect to appear in an English dress; whether the rest will be translated will, we suppose, depend upon the reception which these volumes meet with; and if so, we are much inclined to fear that the unreadable style of the two volumes which have come out, will render the appearance of many more highly improbable. For the rest of the character of M. Arago, we must give it in Baron Humboldt's own words:—

'His name will be honoured wherever respect for services rendered to science, a just sentiment of the dignity of man, and the independence of thought, and the love of public liberty, are preserved. But it is not alone the authority of a mighty intellect which has given to M. Arago the popularity which he enjoyed: the conscientious zeal, which failed not when death approached, the desperate efforts to fulfil up to the last moment the most minute duties, have contributed to the honour in which his name is held. Nor should the charm of his diction, the amenity of his habits and manners, and the kindliness of his character be forgotten. Capable of the most tender devotion, the vivacity of his ardent ~~and~~ and disposition always tempered by its natural sweetness and kindness, M. Arago enjoyed, in the midst of an intelligent and affectionate family, the peaceful happiness of domestic life. In the surviving circle of those most dear to him, M. Arago found all that a touching assiduity, the exercise of intelligent foresight, and the most tender and inventive zeal, could offer to soothe and alleviate during the slow exhaustion of his strength. He died surrounded by his sons,—a sister, Madame Mathieu, worthy of the tender affection of such a brother,—and a niece, Madame Langier, who gave to him the most unremitting and devoted care, and who, at the last moment, showed no less fortitude in grief, than she had done nobleness in her entire and touching self-devotion.'

The editors of 'Popular Astronomy' appear to have enter-

tained fears that the author may be thought verbose. So far from this being the case, we are quite surprised to find that in a course of lectures extending over so wide a field, and containing such an immense amount of details, there should be so little repetition. The author has entirely avoided what in a large number of lectures appears almost inevitable; and is, indeed, occasionally almost necessary,—a brief recapitulation of subjects previously discussed, and arguments adduced in their support. This complete separation of subjects, though detracting from the unity of the book, has the advantage of enabling the reader to devote his attention to any one part of the subject exclusively, and also offers great facilities of reference. It is in this last respect that we think the book is especially valuable, containing, as it does, a complete mine of information as to all astronomical facts and discoveries; the tediousness of the enumeration of mere facts, such as catalogues of stars, elements of orbits, amount of small corrections, &c., being most agreeably relieved by anecdotes connected with the times of the respective discoveries, or relations of incidents of adventure, which from time to time occurred to the author himself.

However, this work by no means confines itself to the past history or the present state of Astronomical Science. The author does not abstain from expressing his opinion as to doubtful points, and, in particular, gives a variety of information respecting the opinions and guesses of philosophers, frequently offering criticisms upon them, and presenting us with his estimate of their value.

Though we are not inclined to think M. Arago's volumes will do much towards remedying the evil of which he complains, we gladly present the reader with his estimate of the value of the literary conversation of society, and the amount of solid information that is derived from attendance at Professorial Lectures; and we commend his remarks especially to the attention of those who have been instrumental in altering the system of education established at our Universities.

‘Listen when you are present at one of those brilliant *réunions*, where are gathered together those whom it is usual to call the social notabilities, listen for a single instant to the long discourse of which the future comet furnishes the text, and then decide if we can congratulate ourselves upon that pretended diffusion of intelligence which so many optimists love to point out as the characteristic feature of our age. As regards myself, I have long since abandoned these illusions. Under the brilliant and superficial varnish with which the purely literary studies of our colleges almost invariably invest all classes of society, we generally find—let us be brief—a complete ignorance of those beautiful phenomena, of those grand laws of nature, which are our best guard against prejudice.’—*Popular Astronomy*, vol. i. p. 655.

But though neither M. Arago's work nor any other profess-

edly popular treatise can take its readers to the bottom of the subject, yet his peculiar powers of illustration must have tended considerably to inform his hearers on the more difficult portions of the science, as his lively style and manner probably created an interest for it in the minds of many. He frequently uses the most homely comparisons, as, for instance, the slices of a melon to illustrate the division of the sphere by the hour-circles, and the slow crawling of a fly upon the surface of a globe from west to east, whilst the globe itself revolves in the opposite direction for the apparent motion of the sun with reference to the fixed stars. The occasional anecdotes which are interspersed with the view of contrasting the rude state of science in ancient times, with the extreme exactness required now, considerably enlivens the volume. Thus, in contrast with the minute divisions and subdivisions of time now used, he quotes the Roman method of the announcing of the moment of sunrise, mid-day, and sunset, by the Consul's Lictor, adding, 'when the sun was concealed by clouds, the reckoning of the day fell into complete confusion.'

In no part of Astronomy is there more room for conjecture than in the Theory of Comets; and here M. Arago's volume is very full of matter. It seems, indeed, as if every possible question with regard to the nature and the paths of these bodies had been touched upon, and it is curious to observe the headings of the different chapters of this 17th Book, which is devoted to 'the Comets.' The subjects are stated one after another—as, indeed, they ought to be—as questions and not as truths. Thus, we have treated in succession the following queries:—

- 'CHAP. XXXII.—Can a Comet come into Collision with the Earth or any other Planet?
- 'CHAP. XXXIII.—Does a Consideration of the Totality of Astronomical Phenomena furnish any Reason for supposing that Comets have ever fallen into the Sun?
- 'CHAP. XXXIV.—Have Comets fallen into Stars?
- 'CHAP. XXXV.—Is the Earth liable to pass into the Tail of a Comet? What Consequences would ensue to our Globe from such an occurrence?
- 'CHAP. XXXVI.—Were the Dry Fogs of 1783 and of 1831 occasioned by the Tails of Comets?
- 'CHAP. XXXVII.—Can the Earth ever become the Satellite of a Comet? and, in the Case of the affirmative, what would be the Lot of its Inhabitants?—*Popular Astronomy*, vol. i. Contents, p. xli.

We know of no other work in the language which gives so much information on this subject. Professedly Mathematical Treatises, such as are used for educational purposes, scarcely touch upon it, and questions regarding them are so much involved in obscurity, that, in popular works in general, they cut a very inconsiderable figure, seldom occupying many pages.

In this volume, we have one-fourth of its bulk dedicated to the Comets and their theory; and as this part of the work represents a favourable specimen of M. Arago's style, and embraces a subject with which most readers will be less familiar than with any other part of Astronomical Science, we will make some extracts from it.

In the preliminary remarks at the commencement of the 17th book, the author gives the following account of his having devoted so large a portion of the volume to this subject. He says—

‘Perhaps the reader will find, on perusing this book upon Comets, that it has an extent out of all proportion with the object proposed in a general treatise upon Astronomy. I must explain the motives which induce me to treat this subject with so much detail.

‘Comets no longer frighten the public, I admit. This is a result respecting which science has certainly the right to congratulate itself. But, in other respects, there remains much to be done. To diffuse in the public mind sound and precise notions will be the best means of preventing writers without authority from placing it at pasture, when one of those mysterious bodies appears suddenly in the heavens, upon predictions, recitals, and accusations, doubly ridiculous from the ignorance and incredible assurance which their authors exhibit. I have proposed to render the astronomy of comets accessible to the public generally. Everybody will thus be in a condition to appreciate, if he please, the immense progress that has been made during the last century and a half. Every one will understand that the gaps which are remarked in this branch of our subject ought to be imputed to the astronomers of antiquity, and not to those of our epoch. In every case the technical expressions designating certain points of the orbits will not be confounded with the points of the heavens distinguished by special physical properties. The *node*, for example, will not be any longer, as was supposed by the writers to which I have just alluded, a region from which the comet had difficulty in disengaging itself. It will be seen, also, what we are to believe of those pretended influences of comets upon terrestrial phenomena. Finally, upon making out the balance-sheet of science (pardon the expression, borrowed from commercial language), it will be admitted that if the *passive* is still considerable, the *active* presents very satisfactory results. Attentive readers—*young astronomers*—will know towards what points they ought to direct their researches. Such a consideration was of a nature to put an end to all hesitation on my part.’—*Popular Astronomy*, vol. i. p. 521, 522.

As we do not profess to write for a class of readers so entirely ignorant of science as M. Arago wished his hearers to be, we shall omit all reference to the following chapters, which give the definitions of terms employed in the theory, as well as the mode of observing and computing the supposed parabolic orbit, and comparing its place as calculated backwards with ancient observations; and, indeed, on this latter subject we have already spoken in describing the discovery of Neptune's orbit. Subsequently the author gives a valuable catalogue of 197 comets, whose elements have been computed, on the hypothesis of their revolving in parabolas—in which catalogue we of

course miss the periodic time and the excentricity. Of the four comets which are certainly known to have returned, we have a very interesting account. They are known by the names of their discoverers—Halley, Encke, Biela, and Faye. We prefer the usual designation of the third comet as Biela's to altering the name to Gambart's, as M. Arago has done, the editors of the translation having clearly shown that the author's observations disparaging Biela's claim to its discovery and the calculation of its orbit are unjust. Want of space obliges us to confine our notice to Halley's comet—which, owing to its long period of seventy-six years, may be regarded as the most wonderful discovery in the field of science—and Encke's, which, in consequence of its short period, has been observed in twelve successive revolutions. Halley's was observed in 1682; and, by comparing its orbit with that of the comets observed respectively in 1607 and 1531, there remains no doubt of the identity of the three bodies. Halley, who was unable, owing to the state of science in that day, to calculate the perturbations, could only predict its reappearance either at the end of 1758 or beginning of 1759. Clairaut performed the necessary calculations, and estimated that its reappearance would take place in April, 1759. The general accuracy of his calculations was proved by its return to its perihelion in March, 1759. And the next step was to calculate the time of its appearance in 1835. This was done by four different astronomers, all of whom agreed that it would pass its perihelion within a few days of the 5th of November, on which day it was actually seen, and passed its perihelion on the 16th day of the same month. By comparison with ancient observations, seven appearances of this comet have been established, and five more, at intervals extending backwards to the year 52 B.C., are more or less probable. Much of the interest attached to this comet consists in the fact that it appeared in a part of the heavens that is known to everybody. We suppose there is no constellation so generally known as the Great Bear; and probably many of our readers who can remember twenty years back may have noticed it there for themselves in October, 1835. It was, in fact, so striking an object that it could not fail to arrest the attention of any one who was acquainted with the seven principal stars in Ursa Major. Encke's comet is called the comet of short period, from its occupying less than three years and a half in its revolution. It was discovered, and its elements calculated, in 1818; and the strong resemblance of its orbit to that of a comet seen in 1805 led to the supposition that they were identical. This supposition has subsequently been proved to be true; and it appears that the same comet must

have been observed in 1786 by Mechain and Messier, and in 1795 by Miss Herschel. That it cannot be connected with a larger number of observations, is owing to its smallness and the faintness of its light, which render it invisible to the naked eye. In his account of this comet the author has been guilty of one very singular omission. This is the more remarkable, because, whatever may be thought of the probability of a theory which this must have been the cause of suggesting to astronomers, it at least should have been noticed as a matter of history. The editors have supplied the omission in a foot-note, which we reprint:—

‘When all the disturbing influences which can affect the motion of this comet are duly taken into account, it has been found that the time of revolution is gradually diminishing on the occasion of each successive return to the perihelion. M. Encke has been induced by this circumstance to suspect the existence of a resisting medium; and by introducing this supposition into his researches on the motion of the comet, he has been enabled to account pretty satisfactorily for the observed diminution of the period. No indications of a resisting medium have been furnished by observations of the motion of any other celestial body; the existence of such a medium cannot, therefore, be considered as definitively established.’—(*Editor.*)
—*Popular Astronomy*, vol. i. p. 541.

The theory of a resisting medium, supposing it to be once established, is fraught with momentous consequences; for it proves that the present order of the solar system cannot subsist for ever, the unavoidable result being that after the lapse of countless ages the planets will fall into the sun. We must not allow ourselves to dwell upon this subject, which is ably handled in Dr. Whewell's *Bridgewater Treatise*, and to that volume we refer our readers for the bearing of this question on the subject of Natural Theology.

The account of Biela's or Gambart's comet gives the author an occasion of discussing the question of the probability of collision with the earth. The following is M. Arago's *παρ' ὁμόνοιαν* on the subject:—

‘It was found that the comet of $6\frac{3}{4}$ years ought to traverse the plane of the ecliptic, that is to say, the plane in which the earth revolves, on the 29th of October, 1832, before midnight.

‘The earth in the course of its annual motion around the sun never quits the plane of the ecliptic. Thus it is in this plane alone that a comet could come into collision with it; consequently, in a case wherein we should have some cause to dread the comet of 1832, it would be on the 29th of October, before midnight, that the danger must have ensued.

‘Let us now inquire whether the point at which the comet ought to pass through the plane of the ecliptic was near any point of the curve described by the earth; for in order that a collision might take place between the two bodies, this condition was no less necessary than the former.

‘Upon this point calculation informed us that the passage of the comet through the plane of the ecliptic would take place a little within the earth's

path, and at a distance from it equal to $4\frac{1}{2}$ radii of the terrestrial orbit. We may mention that this distance, already so small, might vanish entirely if the elements as calculated by Damoiseau had been subjected to small variations, which it appeared difficult to say might not have brought them nearer the true values.

Moreover, let us assume as real, the distance of $4\frac{1}{2}$ terrestrial radii. Let us remark that it is referred to the centre of the comet, and let us see whether the dimensions of that body are sufficiently great that any of those points might have encroached upon points of the earth's orbit.

During the apparition of 1805, the observations made by Olbers, the illustrious astronomer of Bremen, gave for the length of the radius of the comet $5\frac{1}{3}$ rd terrestrial radii. From this number compared with the former, it plainly results that on the 29th of October, 1832, a portion of the earth's orbit was included within the nebulousity of the comet.

There now remains only one simple question to solve, and it is this :—At the instant when the comet was so near the terrestrial orbit that its nebulousity enveloped some parts of it, where was the earth itself to be found?

I have already stated that the passage of the comet very close to a certain point of the terrestrial orbit took place on the 29th of October, before midnight. Well, the earth arrived in the same position only on the morning of the 30th of November, that is to say, more than a month afterwards. We have now only to remark that the mean velocity of the earth in its orbit is 1,665,000 miles per day; and a very simple calculation proves that the comet of $5\frac{1}{3}$ years, at least, during its apparition of 1832, must have been always more than forty-five millions of miles distant from the earth! —*Popular Astronomy*, vol. i. pp. 542, 543.

We had marked many more passages of this interesting volume; but we have already exceeded our proper limits, and we must hasten to draw this article to a conclusion. It will have been seen that we do not anticipate much benefit to the student of Astronomy who attacks the subject without any preliminary knowledge of Mathematics. But we may observe that it may be commenced with a very small stock of such knowledge. A *thorough* acquaintance with Euclid is indispensable, and an acquaintance with the elements of Plane and Spherical Trigonometry will soon be brought into play. With these he may acquire a knowledge of most parts of Plane Astronomy. Physical Astronomy *must* be reserved for the mathematician. But in order to gain any hold upon the subject that is worth having, he must see and do things for himself. He must have his celestial globe, and learn the names and places of the stars by comparing his globe with the heavenly vault. He must be provided with the Nautical Almanack; and though his observations may at first be made with the naked eye, the growing interest of his subject will soon induce him to procure a telescope, to enable him, to some extent, to verify for himself the accuracy of the tables which he uses. Should he be fortunate enough to be enabled to travel, so as to change, to any great extent, his longitude and latitude, he will

gain more insight into the meaning of those terms by one comparison of the time as indicated by his watch with the time pointed out by the clocks of the place where he is, or by the observation of the sun if he is at sea, and by an observation of the altered place of the pole-star, than by many days of reading. There is one disadvantage which to a resident in this country is not removable; we mean the unfavourable nature of the climate. It is not to be wondered at if Englishmen know less about the face of the heavens than the inhabitants of the south. The difficulty of observing the heavens for many consecutive nights, even in the height of summer, is not to be got rid of, and will probably deter many from commencing a subject which, if they had commenced it under a more favourable star, they would never have ceased to prosecute. Again, they must actually go through the calculations for themselves which the treatise they are reading points out the method of performing. It is possible that some who will take as much trouble as this requires, may be led on, in their desire to learn more, to acquire that additional knowledge of mathematics which alone can enable them to advance even a few steps in Physical Astronomy. Even the amateur astronomer may have it in his power to enrich the science with new facts. M. Arago has pointed this out with particular reference to the subject of variable stars, which, as he says, present a rich mine with which professed astronomers, distracted with other labours, have not been much occupied, and which appears to admit of being explored without the use of any larger instrument than an ordinary telescope (p. 261). For those who are more ambitious, and whose ambition is such as to induce them to exert themselves further in this field, we may be permitted to point out, in M. Arago's words, the magnificent future which lies open before them.

'There are in the heavens phenomena which are, relatively to our actual telescopes, what the irregularities in the form of Saturn were, when observed with the very inferior instruments of Galileo. The application of very powerful telescopes, and very high magnifying powers, will render obvious what is yet merely problematical. With these telescopes, when they are adapted to a parallactic mounting, we shall be enabled to determine, by the method of observation of two neighbouring stars, the real distances from the earth of a much larger number of stars than those whose distances are known in the present day; we shall know if there are several which are nearer than α Centauri, β Cygni, and α Lyrae. Then we shall be enabled to follow the changes of form experienced by those agglomerations of luminous matter which we have called nebulae, and to know if the last traces of concentration of these lucid substances are stars properly so called—are real suns. We shall then acquire more precise ideas respecting the physical constitutions of the planets and satellites, which at the present day are included in the domain of conjectures. We shall then study with pre-

cision the revolutions of double stars — those suns which revolve the one about the other—and our geometers will be furnished with the means of deciding whether the force of attraction which governs the movements of the planets of our system, extends even to the extreme limits of the visible universe. Finally, we shall then be able to follow the comets even to their greatest distance, and to deduce, from their changes of volume and form, valuable conclusions relative to the condition of the ether pervading the celestial regions.

‘If we consider that in science the faculty of discerning beforehand forms always the lion’s share, we shall understand how desirable it is that the heavens should be explored by powerful instruments adapted to exact measurement. The discoveries with which astronomy will then be enriched will touch upon the most delicate points of natural philosophy.’ — *Popular Astronomy*, vol. i. pp. 379, 380.

- ART. V.—1. *Memoir of the Rev. W. H. Hewitson, late Minister of the Free Church of Scotland at Dirleton.* By the REV. JOHN BAILLIE. Fifth Edition. Nisbet.
2. *A Memoir of Adelaide Leper Newton.* By the REV. JOHN BAILLIE, Minister of the Free Church of Scotland, Hanover Square. Third Edition. Nisbet.
3. *A Stranger Here: the Memorial of one to whom to live was Christ, and to die gain.* By the REV. HORATIUS BONAR, Kelso. Third Edition. Nisbet.
4. *Memorials of Captain Hedley Vicars, 97th Regiment.* By the Author of "The Victory Won." Twenty-first Thousand. Nisbet.

PROBABLY no kind of reading enjoys such a steady popularity as Biography. Persons who profess to have no head for philosophy, nor memory for history, nor taste for poetry, nor feeling for art—who think science dry, and works of fancy frivolous—will yet sit down with intelligent curiosity to a biography or a memoir. The life of one of the world's good or great men—of any one distinguished as wise, or useful, or adventurous, or humorous, or eccentric—excites expectation in most minds. A page of human nature is about to be unfolded. Our sympathies are at once awakened. How is it, then, that with all this openness to any impression, which is the very spirit of this class of study—this readiness to follow any train of thought the subject may lead us to,—how is it that the whole aspect of things changes in a moment, if the biography proves to be 'religious' biography?—that the curiosity flags at once, the interest fails, and the book, after a cursory glance through its pages, is laid down with unmistakeable distaste, though not without a feeling of self-reproach that it should be so? The authors of the works in question of course find a very ready answer to our question; they bring an artillery of texts to bear on those who cannot read their books:—"The things we tell are to the Greeks foolishness;" "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit;" and much more of the like summary condemnation. Nor would we deny the force of this argument in many cases; but there is another aspect of the question, which, after a perusal of several works of this character, weighs very much with ourselves, by no means so favourable to the biographers, and, in a large degree, exculpatory of the general reader; and this is, that religious biographers, as a class, studiously exclude all *nature* from their subjects. They think it a merit to record only the spiritual element; and while God has made us men and women, with human instincts, feelings, desires,

tastes, affections, sympathies, the more they can produce a character—though this is not the word—a being divested of every characteristic, the more they suppose they are serving the interests of true religion; and having drawn a portrait that every one can see is not human, they congratulate themselves as though it must, necessarily, be divine. There is an interpretation of the doctrine of Original Sin which leads to much of this generalizing. It is taken for granted by a particular school that because man is a fallen creature, and prone to sin, that therefore every impulse, every instinct, every natural emotion and thought, is sin; and that, therefore, virtue and spirituality consist in a suppression of all natural impulses and convictions; they believe, practically, in no inborn monitor, in no inherent love of virtue, in no generous natural emotions. These, if they seem to exist, must all be suppressed, as so many treacherous, specious forms of evil. Every natural taste or sentiment comes under condemnation, and meets the same rough usage—it is natural, and, therefore, it is wicked; and so this fair ruin of fallen humanity, which even in degradation still retains so many traces of its divine parentage—all its sympathy with goodness, all its aspirations after excellence, all its feeling for beauty,—this ‘human heart, by which we live,’ is with all its ‘tenderness, its hopes, and fears,’ ignored, suppressed, defied: and there is exhibited instead, a solemn, self-sufficient, talking, writing, preaching, admonishing, reproving abstraction;—a being before whom we, in imagination, chase away our smiles, compose our features, regulate our movements, conceal our thoughts;—a being, in fact, before whom human nature cowers;—not as it trembles before Divine Justice—not because this abstraction sees into our sinful hearts,—but rather because it judges without seeing, because it assumes a power it possesses not, because it is ignorant, because it has no sympathy, because there is nothing in common between it and ourselves.

The reader of such books as we mean is transported into the cold and dreary land of illusion, where things are not what they seem; where words fail in producing their ordinary impression on the mind; where solemn statements, and even asseverations, produce no conviction; where the personages talk like the publican, but leave a pharisaical savour behind them; where they aver themselves sinners, not once, but a thousand times; yet the persuasion grows strong upon us that they altogether over-estimate their spiritual condition; where the most awful denunciations of self-righteousness, or self in any shape, seem only to echo back the boast, ‘We are the people, and wisdom shall die with us.’

The fault does not always lie with the subject of the Memoir;

it more commonly, indeed, lies with the biographer himself; who, intent, as we have said, on exhibiting spirituality at the cost of nature, puts all his facts in a wrong light, by giving public expression to private feeling; proclaiming from the house-top that which was spoken in closets; and, above all, by suppressing all connecting matter which might give a reason and propriety to sayings and doings, which, standing by themselves, unassisted and unexplained, are conspicuously devoid of both: by these means turning a religious life into a life of professing, talking, religion.

Now, life is a natural process: a man cannot get through it without performing a great many natural processes; without eating, drinking, and sleeping; acting and suffering, loving and hating, quarrelling and making up, thinking, talking, singing, rejoicing, sorrowing, and all after his own fashion, and in a way peculiar to himself: no other man, in all the myriads of beings, like him; no course or experience like his own. And all with circumstances of peculiar interest—every life with a mysterious charm of its own, which we should seek for in vain elsewhere. There is, we believe, no life, however obscure, which a man of genius could not make interesting, awaking thereby a thousand echoes from the general heart. Nay, it scarcely needs genius: sympathy with humanity is enough. We would engage that the bitterest enemy of any of these pattern men—these formal party exhibitions of Christian faith and piety—if he possessed but the gift of reading the human heart, and would tell us all he saw there, though he betrayed every weakness, noted all shortcomings, and gave black prominence to every darker fault,—if only he showed us the man as he really was, would produce a far more loveable creature than we see in the most flattered of these partial, one-sided, ultra-spiritualized portraits; while he would also produce a history of much more general utility. But this sympathy seems peculiarly wanting to religious biographers; and so far from wishing to distinguish between man and man, it seems essential with them that all workings of the soul should be identical. The theological judgment is not satisfied unless its minutest variations of feeling follow in an exact order in fixed rotations, from despair to rapture; all confessions must be in the same words; certain doctrines must in every mind take the same rule of precedence, and new convictions enter in at the same appointed intervals. The effect—if several of these compositions fall in our way at one time—is more monotonous than can be described. We seek in vain for a parallel to it in our own experience. The men we meet with in life seem diverse one from the other; each succeeding person in these books is only a repetition of the last. The question becomes an irksome

and growing perplexity, until the reader, in self-defence, begins to think for himself.

Now where do we find the largest storehouse of sacred biography?—to apply a modern term to the lives of godly men, their ways, words, and works.—In the Bible. The Bible is full of biographies. It contains lives, more or less detailed, of men for four thousand years. Does it follow any formula? Is *their* humanity quenched in the divine life? Do *they* cease to be men because they are saints? On the contrary, natural characteristics are even elaborately portrayed, where the spiritual condition is only implied or taken for granted; or rather we learn it *through* the exhibition of natural character. What care (humanly speaking) is evident not to overlay these human features; to give them play, and let the light shine on them; to show that each man keeps his identity; that natural gifts are good gifts, as far as they go, and are made the instruments of the Divine Spirit for the carrying out the work God gives each of his saints to do; that our hearts may thus be drawn towards them by the strong feeling of brotherhood and a common nature.

As an instance—we choose one where, if anywhere, human characteristics might well be lost in the superadded gifts of the Spirit—take the history of Elijah's translation, and the use, so to speak, that is made of it to exhibit the character of Elisha. All the details lead us to sympathize with him; we are made to dwell on his bereavement and the intensity of his natural affection, and it is through him we learn to realize, in some degree, the miracle itself, and the impression of so stupendous an event on our nature; as well as to understand that congenial natural qualities were selected as the element of the prophetic character, seeing how ardent and intense was the nature chosen in this instance by the Holy Spirit to receive Divine inspiration. How remarkable is his resolute and fixed resolve, twice confirmed by solemn oath, not to leave his master! What keenness of sorrow at the parting! What yearning, what faith through all! What natural (not sinful) impatience at interference from without; showing the nerves high strung, as though at that crisis he could endure no other teaching than from his departing master, or from God Himself! 'Knowest thou that the Lord will take away thy master from thy head to-day? And he said, 'Yea, I know it. Hold ye your peace.' And this twice repeated, and his answer twice recorded. What those two mighty men of God said at their parting, as they still went on and talked, the Spirit has not imparted to us. But the passionate cry of anguish, 'My father, my father,' and the garments rent in two pieces, are recorded *for our learning*. Even the double portion

of the Divine Spirit, just infused into his soul, was not designed—*could* not destroy its human, but still sacred, impulses and emotions.

But it is time to turn from generalities to the particular examples before us. The biographical writers who have given present occasion for these remarks are certain Ministers who seem to represent a school in the Scotch Free Church—a school which appears to unite in itself the rigid peculiarities of the old Covenanters, the flights of modern revivalists, and certain opinions on prophecy which seem to have no necessary connexion with either. Their works have considerable popularity beyond their own body, being published in England, where some have passed through several editions. One, indeed, of the volumes before us, is the Memoir of a lady of our own Church, apparently entrusted by her family to one of these gentlemen—Mr. Baillie—as finding in him more congeniality with her tone of feeling and opinion than they could hope to meet with in a fellow-Churchman. The first, however, that we shall treat, is Mr. Baillie's Memoir of a brother Minister, a Mr. Hewitson, held in high estimation by his brethren, and set forward as an example and almost an achievement of their own peculiar doctrines and principles of action, of which, indeed, he may be regarded as a complete development, his natural disposition well suiting him to be the exponent of a system.

There is one class of persons to be met with in every circle, alike in the world, in literary coteries, and in religion, singular for their sense of personal importance,—of being set apart for great things. It matters not what *line* they take, the impression seems to date from their first consciousness; a sense of pre-eminence never deserts them; they feel their own individuality so intensely as to detract from their belief of the same in others. They cannot help feeling themselves as it were on a pedestal, subject to the universal gaze; what they do is of general consequence; how they should act on any given occasion, is of moment not only to themselves, but to the cause. What they think must be communicated with some circumstances of state to the world, under the impression that their world, whatever that may be, is waiting to know their judgment. What they are, must be constantly settled with themselves; and being endowed with some force of character, and uniformly with a strong will, they are able to state with precision all these necessary enunciations. This peculiar self-assertion inherent in some minds, does in fact set them apart, and make them representatives of their party, and subjects for the biographer. Because such persons are always in an appropriate attitude, their picture is one readily taken; their draperies are arranged in proper

folds; the light upon them is studied; there is nothing careless or hurried about them; they do not make mistakes or forget themselves into the inconsistencies of common existence. Such men are fitted to be leaders of sects and parties, as being little subject to impulses, except such as their will approves, and perfectly safe at least from being misled by any impulse but their own, for they have small sympathy or appreciation of the gifts, the necessities, or characteristics of others. They do not observe others as an independent study, only in their bearing upon themselves, or the cause they identify with themselves, which all gives the effect of singleness as well as strength of purpose, and makes it easy to them to impose rules, to enforce discipline, and an unflinching adherence to principles once laid down. Nature made Mr. Hewitson one of this class; and his religion, genuine though it was, never interfered in this respect with her arrangements.

William Hepburn Hewitson was born in the village of Maybole, in Ayrshire, in 1812. Natural delicacy of constitution preserved him, Mr. Baillie informs us, from any taste for the 'boyish frolics in which the young tinker of Elstow so much delighted,' leaving us thus at starting in doubt whether he censures all boyish frolics, or applies that indulgent term to the 'cursing, swearing, lying, blaspheming,' Bunyan confesses to have been the habit of his boyhood.

'But a spirit was in him which, though it was not to be developed in the form of any glaring enormity, was yet as essentially set on earth, and on earth's things, as ever was Bunyan's in its darkest days. The form which the boy's earthliness took was ambition—love of praise. That fire which afterwards threatened to consume him, body and soul at once, was even now, at the age of five or six, sending forth its scintillations. He used to say, in his boyish simplicity, he would either be a minister or a king; and he would often ask how long time it would take to be a king, and how long to be a minister. At times he would mount a chair, and, with one of his little sisters for precentor, and the rest for audience, would strain his every effort, and often not without success, to move to tears by his words. "I remember," he has been heard to say long afterwards, "what a wicked little creature I was; I got Jane to weep at what I said; I felt pleasure at seeing the effect of my eloquence."—*Memoir of the Rev. W. H. Hewitson*, p. 2.

After a temporary residence in England, his father was appointed parish schoolmaster of Dalmellington, in Ayrshire, a position which offered few advantages to his son, who early manifested a desire for learning, and great powers of application. He studied alone, under great disadvantages, but made considerable progress, being stimulated rather by a desire for success and distinction, than by love of learning for its own sake. His ambition was to be a minister; preaching was an instinct with him, and the desire was as strong in him before his conversion as after. From the time he was three years old, he had

looked forward to it; though as an instance of his early truthfulness, it is recorded that he declared 'he never would be a minister unless he were first a Christian.' Long detained at home by feeble health, at the age of twenty-one he became a student in the University of Edinburgh; there he worked so hard, as seriously to threaten his life, and in less than two years won the Gold Medal and other distinctions. Mr. Baillie boasts, too, of his grasp of thought, of his turn for metaphysical speculation, and even of an incipient genius for poetry, which manifested itself 'in a partly-executed framework of an epic poem;' but if so, we can only suppose that when shortly afterwards he abandoned these pursuits as unworthy a Christian, the renunciation was mutual, and that he was finally deserted by the muse which he contemned; for anything more repulsively dry, and crabbed, and prosy, than his converted style, cannot well be imagined. Previously to this event, however, he wrote for the University Essay, and gained the prize. Mr. Baillie is immensely pompous on the occasion of these successes; there is a sort of swelling elation in recording while he contemns them, which he can scarcely find words big enough to express; as, for instance;—'the glory he has won in the academical arena is "the centaur's maddening tunic."' And again,—

'That winter was a momentous era in his life. It witnessed at once the ascending smoke of the most grateful incense which self had yet offered at Fame's golden altar, and the rude dashing by a gracious God of the censor from the offerer's hand.'—Pp. 13, 14.

Nor is Mr. Hewitson himself less impressive in treating of this period:—

"I was burning to enter the arena of learned competition, and thought life without fame not worth the having. For a while the demon of ambition was lord of the ascendant, and baleful was the influence which it shed upon my character: it was working so effectively the ruin of my soul, that Satan ceased to harass me with fears, as he had done for years before: he deemed it then his most subtle policy to lay to my soul a flattering unction, and, with the bland flapping of a vampire's wings, to lull me into perfect security."—P. 16.

And again, in describing the depression that followed upon his success:—

"My internal history," he again writes—and the words are written on the very scene of desolation—"may be generalized by the remark, that around my heart's fixed centre there has been revolving in panorama a wide circumference of change. The autumnal leaves are now sere and fallow; they tell, with prophetic significance, of the blight and shrunkenness of youthful hopes; the wind is now passing with fitful and melancholy howl; so, too, there is a stir and a rush, as it were, of winds in the atmosphere of the soul; there are, as it were, sighings around the casements and doorways of the heart."—P. 16.

Then follows the history and course of his conversion, for which we have not space. We are told of a period of dejection and anguish of spirit; a period of 'self-righteousness,' and attempts at a 'religiousness' of his own; a sense of failure; and at length sunshine and peace, and full reconciliation. There is a danger of insufficient sympathy towards such communications, but we believe it is in no irreverent spirit that we still trace the influence of a strong will through it all. Two things had from his childhood been determined by him—that he would be a 'minister,' and a minister under certain indispensable conditions. When the time came, the conditions were complied with.

"My mind is composing itself," he writes to the same friend, on 4th May, "under the solemnizing influence of one vast, overwhelming, all-absorbing idea,—that of the responsibilities belonging to the ministry of reconciliation. When I wrote you last (30th January), that idea was oppressive—it sank me into despondency. For two months past, however, I have been all but settled in the determination to go forward, in the strength of the Lord, as a labourer into his vineyard; and so much are my feelings changed, that, whereas I was before afraid to intrude myself into the work of the gospel ministry, I am beginning to be afraid to hesitate or to draw back. 'If any man draw back, saith the Lord, my soul shall have no pleasure in him.'"—P. 29.

Mr. Baillie, who has a curious way of disgorging his reading in whole sentences, the very reverse of the digesting process of which we hear so much, brings much of it to bear upon the solemn occasion of Mr. Hewitson's 'self dedication.' 'Dr. Payson, an American minister, much quoted by him, has supposed the various classes of Christians to be ranged in different concentric circles round Christ, their common 'centre. In the innermost concentric circle Mr. Hewitson 'now took his stand.' Mr. Hewitson was not at all behind his biographer in the state and circumstance with which he announced this long-looked-for occasion:—

'In May he returned to Dalmellington for the summer. His relatives at once remarked the great change. The very night he arrived, he spoke to all the family most solemnly on the concerns of eternity. And the whole village soon saw that he was another man. He had been known hitherto as the great scholar, and the exemplary divinity student; but now they "took knowledge of him that he had been with Jesus,"'

"That," said he, one day soon after his return, laying his hand upon the open Bible,—“that shall henceforth be my daily study; I desire to converse through it daily with God.” The purpose was not unaccomplished. The Bible may be said to have thenceforth become his library. No longer regarding it as a mere hieroglyphic to be curiously examined by the eye of the scholar, he came to it with the heart of a child to listen to the voice of his Father. And out of it he learned that living and fresh divinity which impregnated with its savour his whole future conversation, and correspondence, and ministry.—P. 33, 34.

On this principle he immediately expresses himself, even on common events, in Scripture words. It is quite easy to him to

adopt the language of saints: he would think it a false humility to shrink from doing so. Thus a visit to some friends—'is a pleasant episode in my *pilgrimage*.' He writes to a friend that he is 'determined to confess God before men and devils.' 'Experience has taught me that in my journey heavenward I must pass through much tribulation.' He solemnly renounces ambition—'I shall now be careless that my name pass away from the earth along with this mortal body, if only it be written in the Lamb's book of life in heaven. God will not suffer me to be ambitious now.' 'A little incident,' writes Mr. Baillie, 'strikingly illustrates the intensity of his devotedness; to us this incident illustrates in a much more striking degree his natural character.'

'The gold medal—once the idol of his heart—he forwarded from Dalmellington to a friend in Edinburgh,¹ to be sold, and the proceeds put into the Lord's treasury. His friend, deeming the idol harmless, laid a plan for sparing it: he sent him a cheque for its full money value, and craved leave to retain the medal itself as an *in memoriam*. "My mind is made up," was Mr. Hewitson's characteristic reply, "as to devoting it to the object which I mentioned. This may weigh with you in counterbalance to the feelings which have influenced your—shall I call it?—condemnation of the act. It was only natural that, at first, my reluctance to parting with an object which I once regarded as a trophy of praiseworthy ambition, and round which many once pleasing associations were gathered, should be almost unconquerable; but, by the grace of God, I have got the victory over my natural feelings of reluctance, and most grievous it would be to find them again rising to the ascendant. If the gaining of the prize was a trophy of nature, the parting with it will be, in some measure, a trophy of grace. Your own feelings in the matter will enable you to appreciate the force of what I say. In the meantime, while you keep the medal *in relents*, it will be my part to keep *in relents* the cheque which you so kindly transmitted. The medal is to you not of the slightest intrinsic value; it is only the *prelium affectionis* which it can have in your eyes. I shall be glad to learn by your next that your difficulties have given way and that you have succeeded in effecting the sale.'"—P. 41.

A simpler and less self-conscious person would have kept the medal, because he would not associate it with self so much as with the giver, and if the idea had been suggested to him, it would have seemed a breach of duty to his University to part with it. Naturally he would not retain any active recollection of it as a possession at all; but if through any reason he did perceive it was a snare to him, the sale would have been effected stealthily and quietly, for only thus could the movements of natural pride be surely defeated.

But Mr. Hewitson always let both hands know what he was about; he must employ a partial friend, who he knew would remonstrate to assist in this sacrifice of his idol; or, as Mr.

¹ William Dickson, Esq.

Baillie expresses it, this taking 'away the names of Baalim out of her mouth, and they shall no more be remembered by name.'

In the meanwhile he was injuring his health by 'over-study as a preparation for the ministry, taking no advice till he felt some rest necessary even for his life. This repose was found in what Mr. Baillie designates as 'a mountain apart,'—which means in secular language that for a few months he was tutor in a family of rank. Delicacy of chest, which gave the impression of actual consumption to all who casually met him, indefinitely delayed his ordination; but he was not one to yield to the enervating influence of illness. Perhaps, indeed, a feverish excitement was one attendant of his ailments. He studied, he wrote letters, he laboured. Ordinary relaxations were not congenial to his nature: his religion invested them with positive sinfulness in his eyes—even the ordinary intercourse of society was not lawful; having fallen into a scene of so-called harmless amusement, he writes (for he writes everything): 'Immediately afterwards I made my escape with pleasure. No amusement is innocent which takes away the soul from Jesus, or does what it can to take it away.' And again: 'I never have a moment's peace when I return in the slightest degree to conformity with the world.' And Mr. Baillie's records that—

"With characteristic energy and decision," says Mr. Dodds, alluding to this Fifeshire residence, "he carried out his new views and convictions, even in his familiar letters. No more letters did he write merely as the friend or scholar. Every production of his pen showed the Christian. Not that he gave up the graces of classic allusion, or never indulged in the playfulness of friendship; but he mingled with all he wrote that salt and savour of Christianity, that scriptural illustration and experimental feeling, which gave such a distinctive character to his future life."—P. 46.

The 'playfulness' we cannot respond to; none of it is printed in the book, nor do we believe it to have existed; but we can answer for the fact of his letters containing nothing 'worldly;' which would, no doubt, be the charge against them if they contained any facts, any information, any record of what he saw, any notices of friends, any recognition of the tastes or circumstances of the persons he addressed. They are solemnly free from all these drawbacks. It was his relaxation, no doubt, to write letters; but how they ever came to be *read* or preserved is a real phenomenon. It is a little out of place in the order of dates, but as we are upon the subject of Mr. Hewitson's letters we will present the reader with a specimen of his style, leaving him to judge whether a letter gains in true value by not being a letter at all:—

"TO WILLIAM DICKSON, ESQ.

Madeira, June 5, 1845.

"My very dear Friend,—You are the only one of my Edinburgh correspondents to whom I stand at present indebted; and I gladly take an

opportunity which is now afforded me of balancing accounts, and throwing you again off the side of creditor. Have not we many prayers in heaven, of which we have not as yet received a full acknowledgment? God will surely yet acknowledge them fully, and grant us according to and beyond the desires of our hearts. Though sovereign and free in all that He does for us and gives to us, yet He has, and that likewise in the sovereign, free exercise of His grace, put Himself, by a thousand promises, as it were, into the position of a debtor, on whom we may prefer boldly our claims in Christ, as if we were creditors of the Lord. His promissory notes—His magnificent issues of heaven's paper-currency, representing the unsearchable riches of Christ, the untold bullion of heaven—these coming to us, each with an 'I will give payment on demand to whosoever will,' are sure to be, at length if not instantly, honoured and redeemed. Earthly capitalists can soon run themselves into liabilities which they have not assets enough to liquidate; but 'what God has promised, He is able also to perform.' 'If thou canst believe, all things are possible to him that believeth.'

"Unbelief is often dishonouring God's letters of credit, as if the kingdom of grace were tottering on the verge of bankruptcy, or heaven's traffic in spiritual blessings were subject to the fluctuations and uncertainties which belong to the commerce of this world. But amidst the cautious stock-jobbing hesitations and misgivings of unbelief, the Spirit of Jesus, who has ransacked all the treasures of grace and truth that are laid up in His infinite fulness, restores confidence to the hearts of the merchantmen who crowd the heavenly exchange, saying, with still small voice, 'Blessed are they that believe, for there shall be a performance of those things which were told them from the Lord.' When man's unbelief is asked the value of Jesus, 'Thirty pieces of silver' is the unblushing reply. When the Spirit of God declares His value, he finds the language which men can understand too mean and vile, too poor and shallow, to express the matchless excellence and worth of the Lamb. He speaks of 'height and depth, and breadth and length'—of things past all knowledge and understanding—piles hyperbole on hyperbole; but still the inadequacy of human language leaves the price of Jesus untold. Mountain is piled on mountain; but God's throne is as much unreached as ever, and the light of the glory of Immanuel shines still but faintly on the highest summit of the mountain-pile. Our faith, in its hour of greatest confidence and enlargement, sees only a little, and that little but dimly, of the worth, power, and glory of Jesus. Our liberty, even when our goings under us are least straitened—when we rise on wings like eagles—is fitted to give us only a faint idea of the glorious liberty with which Christ has made us free, and which we are in Christ entitled to enjoy at all times.

"When we become bankrupt ourselves in duty, insolvent, and reduced to extremities, we are sometimes led to think that it is grace that has had an edict of bankruptcy passed upon it; and that the law has found our liabilities so great, that the assets of Christ's merits are not sufficient to meet them. But if we would let God's thoughts, as they are revealed in the Word, come in and fill the chamber of our minds, how different our views and feelings would be regarding both God and ourselves, both His thoughts towards us, and our standing in His sight!"—Pp. 187—9.

This is only half, but the letter never descends to any other tone, or touches on other topics. It charms Mr. Baillie, who ushers it in with the exclamation, 'How vividly he stands before us, the man of prayer and of expecting faith!' We can well understand how a man who always talked and wrote in this

strain, who argued that whatever 'we say to others we ought to 'say it more to God than to them;' who says that 'nothing 'makes this world so much like a wilderness as desire after 'holiness' (p. 239); who 'avoided all fellowship that was not 'in the spirit;' who 'consecrated *all* his private conversation to Christ;' and this, not as every Christian should do, by having Christ in our hearts, but His name for ever on his lips, to the exclusion of every topic suggested by the occasion—should come to have a pretty strong opinion as to the state of religion in the people he found himself amongst; who, whatever efforts they might make to maintain their reputation in his eyes, must necessarily flag in the long run. Indeed it is one of his merits with Mr. Baillie that he was a discernor of spirits: which means, that he was a very free judge of his neighbours' spiritual condition, which he tested by what he believed his own, and had very little scruple about expressing his opinion when formed. Immediately after his conversion, we find him arguing, on the occasion of attending Service at his parish church, that a preacher cannot be 'evangelical,' however sound his doctrine, if he preaches a dull sermon,' saying, 'If Christ dwell in us, the evidences of His gracious presence are not indistinct and illegible.' And again—'So much of Christ as there is in every one, so much of beauty and desirableness, and no more.' He complains when people spoke to him on general topics . . 'How 'many speak to you with as much "strife," or earnestness and 'interest, about the vanities of this passing world, as if they were 'still of the world, and not born from above! You would ever be 'looking unto Jesus; but they will have you to look away to something else, as if something else were more lovely than He who 'is altogether lovely!' 'More converse with God,' he exclaims, 'and less with man, would be health to our flesh and marrow to 'our bones. We cannot converse with God in the company of 'our brethren, unless we meet in the name of Jesus.' And again: 'I find that few seem to love the Lord as the redeemed should 'love Him: often do I feel longings for a higher fellowship than 'I am privileged to enjoy at least with the saints.' 'Scottish 'Christians in general seem not to realize everywhere—in all 'companies and at all times—the presence, the indwelling of 'the Lord Jesus—not to realize in any great measure that they 'are not of this world.' When he has a parish, he describes it as 'physically a wilderness, with here and there a fresh spot, 'adorned by a single lily;' and again while he owns them a people 'united and attached;' yet, while the place is physically beautiful and fertile, it is spiritually 'unshapely and barren.' And this of his own parishioners.

And again he complains with regard to this practice of discerning:—

"A man of spiritual discernment can scarcely open his lips to one who has none," was his remark another day, "without incurring the unmerited charge of uncharitableness, of captiousness, of censoriousness, of assumption, or something similar. He must, in the presence of the ungodly or carnal, 'withhold his mouth even from good,'—or his 'good' will be evil spoken of." This observation explains not a little of his way in his intercourse with men. His very silence sometimes brought on him reproach.

If his silence brought on him reproach, his words sometimes not less offended. Alluding one day to an erroneous construction which a brother had put upon some expression used by him respecting the state of his people, he vindicated the exercise of his spiritual judgment as to the presence or the absence of grace, thus:—"To discern," said he, "is not to act the part of a censor,—it is an act of perception, not an act of judgment at all, in the forensic sense. We may spiritually discern a man's words and doings to be carnal, and yet not be sitting in judgment on the man, in the offensive sense of the expression. Just as we discern colours, saying, that this is red and that blue,—so does the man of God, who has spiritual perceptiveness (*αἰσθησις*), discern the character of moral actions, saying that this is of the Spirit, and that of the flesh—this is of God, and that of the world."—Pp. 389, 390.

In the great national contest which split in two the Kirk of Scotland, Mr. Hewitson sided with the Free party; and David Deans himself could not be more summary in condemnation of the opposite side, as the *world*: 'I regard the "moderate" party as belonging not to the Church, but to the world.' And when some of his brethren evidently objected to the style of his conversation, and that obtrusion of the sacred mysteries of the Gospel upon every company on every occasion, he never for an instant doubts his own discretion, but sets them down as carnal. Mr. Baillie informs us that the following remarks apply to 'cutting reproaches from brethren':—

"If the Lord will," says he, writing to Mr. Dodds on 18th September, "I shall be with you on your communion-Sabbath. May His Spirit be present when the day comes, to make it a day of sweet communion, in the faith and hope of the gospel! How mad a true minister of Christ must appear in the eyes of many! He breathes a spirit, and displays an ardour, which the world cannot understand. The more that we are like Jesus, whom the zeal of his Father's house consumed, or like Paul, whose enthusiasm in advocating what the flesh was unable to appreciate or relish brought on him the charge of being mad,—the more shall we lie open to the ridicule and obloquy of the carnal, and the more shall we be censured as imprudent by those who, though evangelical in face, are 'Moderates' at the core. Eternity with its unchangeable heaven and its unchangeable hell, rebukes the 'moderate' and the carnal,—calling on us to exhibit yet a more close resemblance to Paul in his mad-like enthusiasm, or to the Lord himself in His consuming zeal. Jesus coming into our closet, and breathing on us that we may receive the Holy Ghost, makes us able ministers, and therefore fools in the world's esteem."—P. 323.

The truth was, his mind was too narrow, too absorbed in its own speculations, to be able to receive impressions from without—to receive lessons of any kind from others. Deeply possessed of certain truths viewed through his own medium, and realizing no other truths, he had no patience or tole-

ration with any who would not see things as he saw them: he could not conceive them as otherwise than in that 'satanic' state of the flesh' he so often talks of. Of such he says: 'Enjoyment without Christ is the beginning of hell;' though the enjoyment he means might be perfectly innocent in its nature, only not consciously connected with the great work of our redemption. For the wonders of creation engaged none of his attention. He was utterly blind to them, not so much by nature as on principle, and through the inevitable consequence of his being engrossed with his own thoughts. He says: 'These holy sentiments can only be cherished and strengthened by looking away from things created;' and this he did with a remarkable consistency on all occasions. He travels—sees Germany, Lisbon, Madeira, but has never anything to say about all these places, not one remark to make but on the state of his own soul; of Madeira, that loveliest of God's works, he just says, after he has left it:—

'I saw little of Madeira, but it will be more worth while to see it when the new heavens and the new earth are made. I care not though I never see the magnificent places of the earth till then.'—P. 246.

And this insensibility towards the works of God's hands all passes for the extreme of spirituality with his biographer. But in spite of the pains he takes to prove the success of Mr. Hewitson's invariable tone of conversation, it is evident many were repelled, if not disgusted. Persons who saw him for a little while, and who were equal to the demands made upon them, would, like Dr. Chalmers, notice complacently 'the unction of spirituality that savoured his conversation;' and others, 'that he was more like a being come from another world to declare his message and return to it again.' But it was clearly otherwise with those whom circumstances brought into constant communication. Mr. Baillie speaks with bitterness of his loss being a relief to *some*. If he stays any length of time in one place we find him complaining of 'dryness' and 'deadness,' as we have shown, and there are indications of impatience which would increase this distaste; and of intolerance of opposition hardly consistent with that 'heavenly savour' which he is stated always to have left behind him. This he confesses with more candour than his biographer, though in his own characteristically pompous way:—

'A letter of this period illustrates a feature of character which those who knew him will recognise. In conversation, he had been betrayed into warmth of argument: he had abruptly left the table, and sat alone on the sofa all the rest of the evening, uttering scarcely a word. "My last visit," he writes, on December 21, expressing, some time afterwards, the pain which his hastiness of spirit had occasioned him, "was, in one respect, to myself a memorable because an humbling one. The spirit of the meek and lowly-hearted Jesus, was grieved by my want of long-suffering. If my sin had been secret, I would have spoken of it to the Lord alone; but,

when we sin in one another's presence, we should remember the words, 'Confess your faults one to another.' We are Christ's witnesses in the world, called on to show forth His glory by our lives as well as by our lips. We must live over the life of Christ on earth; we must breathe the breath of Christ among men; we must show what He is, by being in the world even as He was in the world; we must be holy as He is holy. We need to walk circumspectly, ever identifying ourselves with Christ."

"I am sure," remarked Mr. Hewitson on one occasion, "many think me very disagreeable." Without waiting for a reply, he added, "I never utter my mind on a subject till I have studied it, and formed my judgment. I like then to meet with sympathy, and shrink from those who cannot extend it to me." This often gave to him an air of dogmatism, which strangers did not relish. But the instance narrated will show how tenderly alive he was to this failing.—Pp. 260, 261.

There was, in fact, that 'sourness' in his nature which a conscious overstrained spiritualism always engenders. We find him nearly at the close of his long illness repelling sympathy in an ungracious way. It is, no doubt, troublesome to many invalids to be inquired after and questioned as to the state of their health, but an amiable disposition appreciates the motive, and patiently bears the inconvenience. Mr. Hewitson paid visits, and talked to strangers, looking like death itself: people pitied him, and expressed solicitude which annoyed him and rankled in his mind, and no man of the world could have shown his annoyance more testily or at a worse time:—

'A characteristic little incident occurred as he was leaving the house where he had been sojourning. "I hope you have been comfortable during your visit," said his kind host. "Yes," was his reply, "with the exception of one thing—I have been annoyed by so many people continually inquiring about my health." "He never felt comfortable," adds our correspondent, "when any one did so. I recollect, on one occasion in my presence, he said to a friend of mine, 'I shall never be better than I now am, until the resurrection day,'—meaning, he was quite happy under all his infirmities.'"—Pp. 350, 351.

Asceticism is a charge usually confined to Rome, and to those who are supposed to have 'Romanising tendencies;' but when it is with any fairness used as a term of reproach, we presume it means man's imposing harsher terms of salvation than God prescribes in his Holy Word. It ought not, certainly, to mean a man's laying down rules for himself, as thinking that certain restrictions benefit him personally, are good for his individual soul,—for natures do differ, and indulgences, innocent and even salutary to some minds, are injurious to others. But when a man from laying down rigid rules to himself and denying himself certain allowed pleasures, proceeds, as he too often does, to impose his own personal rule and law upon the Church at large; because he thinks it best for himself not to marry, to disparage marriage as a state; because he finds it best for himself not to drink wine, to assert all wine drinking as unlawful, because he finds ordinary social intercourse too great a

temptation in his case, to cry down all cheerful society; because the cultivation of the taste in his own case ministers to vanity, to forbid all accomplishments to the whole body of Christians; because he needs no relaxation, to impose unlimited labour on all around; because he can sustain contemplations and a spiritual frame of mind for a long period undisturbed, to condemn all others differently constituted as carnal:—this we call asceticism, when men by that word mean not the enduring hardness ourselves, but something false and unscriptural; and in this sense the Church of Rome is not so ascetic as Mr. Hewitson, for she distinguishes between one nature and another, Mr. Hewitson and his party would govern the whole Church by their own idiosyncrasies. The rule of Scripture seems to be that individuals may follow their own leanings in spiritual self-government to almost any extent, so long as they do not interfere with the liberty of others and the rules of the Church; but when once men set up their private rule as a general law, then Scripture steps in to reprove them as being wise above what is written, as making the heart of the righteous sad whom God has not made sad, as interposing their human law between the soul and its Creator, Redeemer, and Judge. For this rigour is a dangerous thing; it not only imposes needless restraints, inducing in characters not strong enough to bear them, and too weak for resistance, a tendency to pretence and mere profession; but it always results in the imposition of new articles of faith, as we believe the history of Christianity will show. The simplicity of the Gospel is unsatisfactory to minds who have to sustain these self-imposed efforts. Having rejected natural relaxations of thought, they need stimulants of another kind; they need a feeling of partisanship, a companionship in certain exclusive views, which are, as it were, the travail of their own souls, and which assume a proportionate prominence in their system. With Mr. Hewitson and his party this new dogma is what they designate Premillenarianism. Towards the end of his career it becomes evident that Mr. Hewitson could not cordially sympathise with, nay, more, we suspect he could scarcely be patient in the company of any persons, whatsoever their profession, who were not Premillenarians: a wonderful delusion, we must submit, without entering into the question of its truth or falsehood; only of its relative importance amongst other articles of belief. For what is the question of the *time* of Christ's coming, compared to the fact that He will certainly come at some time to judge the world? What is the reigning with Christ a thousand years on earth to those who hope to reign with Him an eternity in heaven? However, it is certain that opinions that are disputed obtain an unreasonable hold on their adherents, and this dogma is found according to all its

advocates to have great quickening power; and it evidently *has* a very exciting influence, and may lie at the root of much of the irreverence in the mention of our blessed Lord which disfigures the devotions of this party. Not so much in Mr. Hewitson, who had certainly a serious mind, and a deeper earnestness than others we shall have to notice, together with more practical ideas on the subject of confession and self-discipline, and a larger understanding; still in him there is something to regret on this head. His excitement, however, lay more in anticipating and exulting in the prospect of the tribulations and convulsions that were to usher in this advent so immediately at hand. He sees its approach in every event, great and small; it is his only gauge of the interest and importance of any question; he hails it in the troubles of his own communion, in the disturbances of nations; and the conviction founded on this interpretation of prophecy he calls 'a second conversion,' an expression which affords a curious comment on that state of feeling which he calls his first. We might extract largely from his letters on this subject, showing the confidence of his predictions, sometimes not so much predictions as history; but late events have made our readers so familiar with the language and views held on this question, and with the irrepressible arrogance, which no failure can humble, of these interpreters, that we will spare them. He thus expresses his view of the benefits of this expectation, premising that with this school the words 'Hope,' 'Blessed hope,' 'that day,' all the allusions to the judgment-day, are interpreted to mean the 'Personal Reign.'

'In Kelso I find many godly people, who are waiting for the Lord's coming. Our hope is truly a blessed one, and much to be cherished. It has power, more than anything else, to make us feel that we are set down as strangers in a strange land, and to wean our affections from the things of this evil world. Anything that keeps us near the living person Christ Jesus, transforms us into his likeness; and the expectation of his advent is especially fitted to have this effect.'—P. 296.

Partly his precarious, failing health, and partly, we believe, the nature of his views, and the effect they had on his practice, made his life a desultory one. Before his ordination he was licensed to preach, but found his strength unequal to any continuous effort. The principal labour of his life was in association with Dr. Kalley, who will be in our readers' recollection, in his proselytizing efforts in Madeira about ten years ago. Finding that Mr. Hewitson's health forbade his preaching in his own country, for the present, at least, it was proposed that he should go to Lisbon and there study the Portuguese language in preparation for preaching to the natives of Madeira. With this view he was ordained by the Free Church Presbytery in 1844, and proceeded at once to Lisbon, where he made rapid

progress in the language. Eventually he joined Dr. Kalley, who had already become exceedingly odious to the authorities in Madeira. Jointly they are represented as producing great effects, and their converts suffered much from imprisonment and various forms of persecution, while the clergy, perplexed by this inroad into their province, could find, we are told, no better argument than to denounce the Bible as a book of hell. The history of this mission is given at much length, and Mr. Hewitson laboured with great zeal. But the position of affairs was necessarily not satisfactory. In the first place, it hardly seems fair to attack popery in Madeira, because that country is open to the English as a kind of hospital for our national disorder. Backed as our countrymen are by a powerful government at home, the temporal evils that ensue must inevitably fall on the converts, and be felt comparatively lightly by the apostles of the movement. True Dr. Kalley once suffered imprisonment, but of a very different character from his proselytes, for he kept his room full of Bibles, which he could supply to the colporteurs at his discretion; and he was visited, on Sabbaths, by seventy or a hundred friends. Eventually Lord Aberdeen took the middle course of demanding damages for his imprisonment, and warning Dr. Kalley that he could not be supported by the English Government if he assembled Portuguese subjects at his house contrary to the wish of the Madeira authorities. After this his proceedings were carried on with some secrecy, but still so as to raise much suspicion and to excite popular rage and tumults, so that Dr. Kalley at length escaped to an English ship from the clutches of the mob, disguised in woman's clothes. And here, though we do not say it was necessary that he should stay to be murdered, yet it jars upon one's feelings to read,—

‘The converts were now to enter the seven-times-heated furnace. Shall they stand this fiery trial? The removal of Dr. Kalley was to them the signal to expect all manner of cruelty and oppression. Many of them immediately fled from their houses to the mountains, where they have been savagely hunted by their relentless persecutors. It is truly heart-rending to hear of their sufferings. When discovered in their hiding-places, they were mercilessly beaten, to extort from them a promise that they would go to confession. A few days ago a man was most brutally murdered, and several women have sustained injuries from which they are not expected to recover.’—P. 225.

This happened in August, 1845. In the previous May Mr. Hewitson had been ‘led in the providence of God to form the resolution of leaving Madeira for a few months,’ intending afterwards to return and resume his labours. He pressed upon the Free Church of Scotland the necessity of a *native* ministry, which at this crisis we do not understand; in fact, he proceeded to ordain six elders and several deacons to conduct the meetings during his absence. He himself returns to England, and writes his poor persecuted flock a pastoral letter. Ultimately the

body of converts, who seem to have been very sincere and much enduring, emigrated to the number of 700 to Trinidad; where the next year Mr. Hewitson paid them a three months' visit. Altogether the history does not bear out Mr. Baillie's lofty tone, though we attribute any shortcomings rather to a want of heartiness in Mr. Hewitson's nature,—of love to his fellow-creatures, because he knew them and they knew him, not as just so many abstract souls,—than to want of courage. We are struck by the coolness and conciseness of his notice of his first meeting with these poor converts at Trinidad. All he says to his sister, to whom he writes, on his landing, is:—

'Passing by the meetings and greetings and embraces, the tears and laughings, of kind and cordial welcome on the part of many well known in Madeira,—I had a meeting for worship on Saturday evening, and on Sabbath I entered upon a regular system of ministration once more in a foreign tongue.'—P. 269.

We should have thought some *names* might have been mentioned, some intimation that he had made his own family acquainted with some of these poor people on whom he had brought such an amount of temporal evil and suffering, though he was satisfied it was for their real and lasting good. We only relate Mr. Hewitson's success at Madeira, as he thinks proper to state it. We believe that this proselytizing was simply mischievous, and that though Dr. Kalley and his friends destroyed the old faith of the converts, they supplied no substantial religion in its place. We know that the persecution is exaggerated. But we are only concerned with Mr. Hewitson's account of his own conduct; and we must remark that, in fact, he had not the genial qualities suited to a missionary. On his return to Scotland, he commenced what is called a 'wandering ministry,' 'preaching on Sabbaths and week-days, and leaving behind him in every place the savour of his heavenly walk.' A sense of dulness and flatness seemed to haunt him. He was always longing for 'revivals.' 'I feel the effects of the deadness which is reigning around. There is a much-to-be-lamented want of lifelikeness and of spiritual sensibility in the Church, at the present hour. O that these brassy heavens were rent.' At his own home, Dalmellington, he is particularly sensible of this '*restraining* grace,' this '*prevailing drought*,' 'the Lord's *marked* silence;' indeed, we must say that the inhabitants of Dalmellington, and of his subsequent charge of Dirleton, must be more than human if they do not take a little in dudgeon the mode in which their shortcomings are paraded before the world; but we perceive from his other work, before us, that Mr. Baillie is quite independent of all such feelings; he writes for a small elect circle, and the world outside are as much dogs to him as ever the Gentiles were to the Pharisees of old.

This is not the spirit for a parish pastor, and no sooner does Mr. Hewitson receive a unanimous call to Dirleton, than he proceeds to make a church within a church, though that at Dirleton had already been sifted of its carnal element, by the recent disruption.

‘In Dirleton there was formed, secretly and unostentatiously—known, indeed, only to its members and to him whom most of them regarded as their spiritual father—a little circle of believers, with whose exercises, and trials, and triumphs of faith Mr. Hewitson was not less familiar, and for whom he watched daily with a not less tender solicitude. These were the Aarons and Hurs of his ministry; held up by their prayers and sympathy, he fulfilled his course. As each new convert entered the little family, gladness pervaded all. During all the time of his ministry at Dirleton, he was never without at least one anxious soul. And rarely did the anxiety fail to issue in true peace.’—P. 351.

However, though he intimates that labouring amongst his parishioners at large was like preaching to clods of the valley, he did not neglect them. He was energetic in his preaching, which is called his ruling passion; he held meetings and Bible classes, and visited from house to house; in all his proceedings showing that profound ignorance, and indifference to individual character, which marks this class of minds, and is an especial feature in Mr. Hewitson’s. This is a specimen of the mode in which he introduces himself and his ministry to his people.

‘Another example may be noted. “Where do you live?” said he to a member of his congregation, whose face he knew, but whom he had not yet visited. “In the room up-stairs,” was the answer. “Well, I hope you invite the Lord Jesus into your room to dwell with you. He always delighted to enter into the upper room in Jerusalem, with the disciples of old, to hold converse with them. And Jesus is the same to-day as He was then—still as willing to hold communion with the sinner. Would it not be blessed to dwell with Jesus, the eternal Son of God?” He spoke home to her conscience, and pressed on her the duty and privilege of immediately closing with Christ.’—P. 330, 331.

As a specimen of the tone of his ministrations at this period, Mr. Baillie also inserts some of his letters, from which we extract one or two paragraphs, as curious instances of his entire absorption in his own meditations, irrespective of the probable state of feeling of the recipient, in this case his father.

“April 17, 1848.—[To his Father.]—‘Christ our passover is sacrificed for us,’ Am I in a blood-sprinkled dwelling? Is the blood of Christ really on my soul? Have I peace with God through the blood of Christ? Have I no false peace, that is, no peace but that which the blood of Christ gives to my guilty soul? Do I see and feel that the blood of Christ destroys guilt, even as stubble is destroyed by the flaming fire? Do I know that the blood of Christ has extinguished the flames of hell which were kindled for me? or are these flames, in consequence of my unbelief, still burning?”’—P. 317.

“What need of being in earnest! I flee from the wrath to come; my dear father, flee with me to the blood of Christ—come with me into the blood-sprinkled dwelling. You will be safe there; but, without, there is

no safety. The storm is lowering, the flames are burning, the wrath of God is coming; but here is an open door, sprinkled with blood—come in! fast; here is a cleft in the rock—come and hide here; there is yet room in the wounded heart of Jesus—room for you, room for dear mother, room for all the rest. Oh, come in—come in, all! Let us all hide in the bleeding Saviour, till the indignation, which is coming, be overpast.”

‘And again:—

“‘Damned,’ ‘lost’—these are God’s words; and, oh! who can fathom all the depths of horror, and despair, and woe, which they mean? When a sinner is dragged to hell, with these words, ‘damned,’ ‘lost,’ written upon his forehead,—who can tell the millionth part of the pang of anguish that pierces him through and through, and that is doomed to pierce him through and through for ever?”—Pp. 317, 318.

We often hear of the enormous length of the ‘table services,’ and the prayers and preaching connected with them, in the Scotch kirk. Mr. Hewitson, in spite of his health, was not likely to abate a moment of time on that account; indeed, while he was himself officiating he never seemed to feel fatigue; but how must a congregation suffer under such protracted excitement, or what is designed to be such, as is implied in the following account of one of these days?

“Yesterday we had a full, or very nearly a full, church; and the season was exceedingly solemn outwardly. I trust that in many cases the inward experience was of a suitable kind, and that the Lord was working with power in many hearts. His own believing people seemed to be glad. We were in from half-past eleven A.M. till half-past four P.M., and afterwards from half-past five till, I think, nearly half-past seven. I am fatigued this morning, but have great cause to be thankful to the Lord for all the good which He yesterday made to pass before me.”—P. 316.

Nor did the strain on the attention of his flock end here, for, as may be supposed, he was very rigid on the question of keeping the Sabbath.

‘Nothing more grieved him than to find topics uncongenial with its true sanctity forming the theme of conversation. To substitute, for news or business, only sermons, or ministers, or doctrines, or ecclesiastical policy, he regarded as the mere shell of Sabbath-sanctity. His Sabbath evenings did not obliterate the holy impressions of the sanctuary.’—P. 328.

While he himself was the talker, and could descant on the subjects his own mind was full of, he might possibly satisfy himself; but to expect this effort from mankind at large, implies a really wilful blindness to human capabilities.

‘But though his spirit did not flag, his frame sank under exertions so peculiarly trying to his constitution. His active labours did not continue more than a year; and after lingering through the last stages of consumption, he died in August, 1850, supported through the last struggle, not by those speculations which had so possessed his living mind, but by the consolation

common to every Christian, that Christ had trod the way of death before, endured its agony, and conquered its terrors.

The life of every earnest Christian demands respect. It is as an example to others that we take leave to question the value of the present memoir, and especially of Mr. Baillie's share in the work; but if his peculiarities as a biographer offend our feelings and taste, when he exhibits a character so rigid and angular as that of his brother minister and friend, who, after all, is too marked in his outlines to be susceptible of much misrepresentation—much more do they jar upon us when he undertakes to portray a female saint, upon his own ideas of excellence; for, though the memoir is of a real person (Miss Newton), the book is so full of Mr. Baillie—his thoughts, his reading, his views—that the young lady sinks into an abstraction beside the living memorialist. We are told of the lady, but we cannot help being absorbed in Mr. Baillie. The memoir itself contains so little to fasten on the mind, the events are so simple—an occasional journey to Malvern or Torquay, or a visit from a congenial friend, expressed by an initial or a blank—the letters are all so exactly alike, to whatever letter of the alphabet they may be addressed, that, in the presence of Mr. Baillie's affectation, ignorance, parade, and general obtrusiveness, they all recede into the background. The showman's burly air and peculiar diction so engross our faculties, that we are comparatively careless of the exhibition we have come to see. For example, the table of contents in a book is generally supposed to refer to its main subject; we should expect all the notices there to refer, in some way or other, to Miss Newton, but their real use, in this case, is to display the varied reading of Mr. Baillie. For instance, when we see the words, 'Blumlis Alps,' in the heading of a chapter, we should conclude her on a tour in Switzerland, but, on looking to the page, we find the chapter opens with the following reference to those mountains.

"Our drive through the vale," writes a Swiss traveller, "brought us full in the view of the snowy Blumlis Alps, at sunset. What a form of majesty and glory! How he flings the frowning mantle of the evening sun down upon us, as if he were about to ascend in fire from earth to heaven!" Adelaide Newton now enters on a course of discipline which reminds us, at every step, of that sun-mantled Alp.—*Memoir of Adelaide Leper Newton*, p. 41.

Frequently we find the name of Lord Bacon amongst these headings, from which we might at least infer that the young lady's mind had been formed and strengthened under a patient, deep study of his philosophy. We have no reason to suppose she ever read a line of Bacon, nor do we imagine that Mr. Baillie himself has drunk deeply of that spring; nevertheless he thinks

this a good occasion for showing what he *has* read. Thus we have in the contents, at one time, 'Living Martyr—Bacon—Cecil;' at another, 'The earthen pitcher,—Bacon—Birthplace,' at another, 'Lord Bacon, another self.' On reference, we find all these pompous allusions have no other bearing on the subject than Mr. Baillie chooses to give them, and that if he were entirely to reverse his authors and quotations the sense would not suffer. One chapter complacently opens, both in the heading and the page, with the poet *Spenser's* lines, which prove to be Waller's well-known simile of the 'soul's dark cottage,' misquoted. A man can never have read a line of either poet with any intelligence thus to confuse the thought and style of the two; which would, after all, signify little, if there was not the pretence of general reading. All this parade, this ushering in each chapter with recondite authorities, as though all the intellect of the world had been prophesying of Miss Newton, is simply to conceal the real poverty of the subject; for there is nothing in the character of the young lady, as he shows it, or in the incidents of her life, to make a book of.

And this straining after great effects, this unvarying posture of admiration in her eulogist, is most unfavourable for the end he has in view. Indeed, how a young girl gradually failing under that most interesting of all disorders, pulmonary consumption—one, to judge by her portrait, of pleasing countenance, and whom we see to have been deeply interested in the one greatest concern of her immortal soul—could be made so unattractive, is a mystery. We suspect it can only have been done by Mr. Baillie's carefully excluding every natural trait that came under his observation, as an impertinence, a thing to be hustled out of the way, as interfering with his ideal. In ignorance of the actual character, we can only judge of the portrait drawn by Mr. Baillie, which is founded, we presume, on his personal knowledge, her own writings, and her friends' reports; of which his bad taste, and little discernment of what is lovely in the female character, has made the worst. And, really, the poor young lady, thus handled, is made a sort of paragon of assumption and egotism—one long I, I, I, from beginning to end. What she is, what she thinks, what she feels, what she does; her theological opinions, her judgment on controverted points, her decisions on spiritual difficulties, her interpretations of Scripture, her insight into mysteries, are all detailed, laid down, and enlarged on, with visible self-satisfaction, and a confidence in her own judgment which admits of no misgiving. She has no doubts of her fitness, intellectual or spiritual, for the determining of any question whatever, from a passage in the Canticles, or the Epistle to the Hebrews, to the precise condition, in the sight of God, of any

of her acquaintance. Of course, it is the exclusive exhibition of one side of her character, what may be called the preaching element, and the exclusion of everything simple, natural, or unconscious, which makes the picture so intolerable; and much of the unfavourable impression is directly traceable to Mr. Baillie's swelling, turgid style, his adulation of his subject, his extravagant encomiums, and the disproportion between the incidents he has to relate, and the language he employs. She probably won this doubtful gain of his warm regard by her enthusiastic appreciation of his *Life of Hewitson*, which she read four times, with ever increasing delight, feeling his mind so exactly like her own. Stimulated by this sympathy, his narrative opens with the following preposterous exordium:—

'The town of Derby cannot boast of many holy memories; but He who noted Bethany as "the town of Mary and her sister Martha," has noted the birthplace of ADELAIDE LEPER NEWTON. It was on the 1st of March, 1821, that an infant who was to leave behind her so precious a fragrance was ushered into this vale of tears.'—P. 2.

How a 'minister of the Scotch Free Church, Hanover Square, London,' which is Mr. Baillie's present style and address, should be able to pronounce so decidedly on the 'holy memories' of a town in the Midland Counties, of some forty or fifty thousand inhabitants, is not explained; but it is a curious example of the length to which this school will go in forming spiritual estimates. Further on we find the following language employed on occasion of a change of lodgings at Torquay. The chapter from which we extract it is headed, 'Living Martyr—Bacon—Cecil.' 'New Tent in the Wilderness,' &c. &c.:—

"Martyrdoms," says Lord Bacon, in one of his essays, "I reckon amongst miracles, because they exceed the strength of human nature." Of martyrdoms there are two kinds. "Perhaps," writes Cecil, "it is the greater energy of Divine power which keeps the Christian from day to day, from year to year, praying, hoping, running, believing against all hindrances, which maintains him a LIVING martyr, than that which bears him up for an hour in sacrificing himself at the stake." Bacon in his essay above quoted has the same thought; for after reckoning martyrdoms among miracles, because they exceed the strength of human nature, he adds, "I may do the like of superlative and admirable holiness of life."

'It is this kind of martyrdom which is before us in the subject of our memoir, and each successive season seems to encircle it with a brighter halo of Divine glory.

'Writing to one of her sisters, from her "new tent in the wilderness," she says: "The first note I write is to you, on a day which I trust is to both of us but a foretaste and pledge of that eternal Sabbath which remaineth for us! Oh! what a prospect for souls who find no rest for the soles of their feet in the ocean of life! Tossed to and fro, sometimes in their temporal circumstances, sometimes from one home to another; sometimes in their souls, beat about, buffeted by the god of this world, and tormented by the evil workings of their corrupt natures, till really they do

literally feel like the dove out of the ark, hovering over a boundless expanse of ocean. I have never felt so more than lately."—*Ibid.* p. 73.

Denuding the narrative of such ornaments as these, and endeavouring to reach the correct facts of the case, the real truth seems to have been this:—Born apparently in a luxurious home, where, we are told, 'her charming manner was never for 'an instant spoiled by the praises which were continually heaped 'upon her by the social circle;' surrounded all her life by the tenderest cares, she early took up religion (there is much to justify the expression) with great enthusiasm, receiving the admiring sympathies of her family and friends for the mode in which she carried out her convictions. She seems never to have encountered the smallest difficulty, nor was her will once checked on this point. Having a father and mother, of whom there is only a casual mention, and sisters—what may be called the ordinary ties of family—she seems, nevertheless, to have been permitted from the first absolute control over her own actions, the mode of spending her time, the choice of her friends. She gives up her girlish accomplishments, thinking her success in them might minister to carnal pride, without apparently raising a single remonstrance; there is no trace amid all her trials in that 'living martyrdom' claimed for her, of her ever having been once interfered with or thwarted in any of those points which are the salutary discipline of so many. Before she is twenty she injures her health by district visiting. How she should have been allowed to do so is strange to us, though it seems all proper and creditable to Mr. Baillie. How she should have been permitted up to the age of twenty-two to spend four days at least of every week in her district, 'of at least one hundred houses:' which means in her case preaching premillennarianism from door to door, from ten in the morning till five in the evening, constantly hurrying home from these seven hours' labours too late for dinner, 'fairly tired out with each day's work;' how the duties and wholesome restraints of home lay so light upon her, we are not told, but so it was. Eventually her health broke down; after one of these exhausting days she took a chill which fell upon the chest, and for the last seven years of her life she was an invalid, not, however, receiving any reproaches from her own family or her conscience for the imprudence which led to these consequences. After this period she suffered from ill health, nor do we wish to make light of this trial, but *every* alleviation came with it. Long seasons of relief from pain; constant change of scene; freedom from the irksomeness of uncongenial society; and the unrestrained companionship and correspondence of persons of her own views; an active brain, a ready pen, an intense enjoyment in expressing her

thoughts, convictions, and states of feeling, sustained by the sense that everything she said, thought, and wrote was of importance and destined to perform a great work in God's service—that every spoken and written word was, as she expresses it, 'seed;' with unlimited time at her command to study Greek and Hebrew, and to write tracts and commentaries and paraphrases—works with which we are unacquainted, but which her friends congratulated her upon, and which constituted her happiness in the doing, in the retrospect, and in their supposed efficacy, of which she records many examples.

Such a life is *not* one of extraordinary trial, whatever Mr. Baillie may say. It was as far as we can see, a life of congenial excitement from beginning to end, sustained by a sense of usefulness and importance and superiority which really never flags. Thus we find such sentences as these; writing to her sister, 'Should we ever have been what we are if we had led the uncrossed lives so many young people lead?' On one occasion she is left in a boarding-house for a few weeks, and after alluding to her utter inability to speak to '*these* people' (p. 76), she adds, 'but I pray that God may use me to say what He wants saying to them.' And again: 'Don't you find more and more that the things which occupy the minds and hearts of others lose their interest with you? There is a craving of the immortal soul for higher objects.' In May, 1848, in her twenty-fifth year, she writes: 'I am now re-writing my texts on Canticles, and fresh beauties open to me in every verse. And yet how intensely little the most deeply experienced Christian knows of the fulness of the Word of God.' Again: 'I have been trying lately rather to lay aside all difficult subjects on Scripture study, from the conviction that I am studying them intellectually rather than spiritually. Perhaps it is a danger few are so much exposed to.'—P. 120. Again:—'Do all to the glory of God. Do, if you can, make that a higher aim and object even than your own benefit. Forgive me for saying so. It is because I have found such precious enjoyment in turning my ordinary employments to spiritual good in that way, that I mention it to you.'

If we wish to know a person's real estimate of themselves, we must study their language of self-depreciation. In spite of the humility on the surface of the following words, we see that their only possible meaning implies a belief in herself as the instrument of direct inspiration, thus putting herself on a wholly different and higher footing from those commentators who fit themselves for their work by careful study and sound learning:—

'I cannot do Hebrews, I am so humbled over it still. I seem to have no power to touch it. How dependent we are upon God, are we not? I

have not a word to say till He opens my lips; and I feel as if He had laid me down with my face on the ground, and as if I must wait till His hand touched me and set me on my feet again. It is worse than useless to try to do anything in my own weakness (I need not call it strength).—P. 329.

On one occasion, recording a visit to the Hon. Mrs. C——, she writes:—

‘I have not been able to enjoy Mrs. C—— at all as I hoped, for they have another friend staying here, who cannot understand anything beyond the merest A B C of religion, and Mrs. C—— is one of the few who love to read the word of God with me, and to dig into the hidden treasures of Christ to be found in it. Still I hope that though disappointing, I may be learning lessons to conform me to Jesus, especially in bearing the infirmities of the weak, and in feeling what it is not to be at all understood. How trying that must have been to Him; must it not?’—P. 223.

She believed herself peculiarly endowed with natural feeling:—‘I love so deeply.’ ‘This place is so beautiful that perhaps natural feeling excites me too much;’ and of her accomplishments:—‘Like yourself,’ she writes to a schoolfellow, ‘my heart naturally clung very much to the world. Music was my great snare. I took infinite pains to play well, and delighted secretly in the praises I got *whenever I played before any one*. Fancy now its being nearly four years since I have touched piano or organ, and my singing, which I had once even more reason to be satisfied with, is probably for ever silenced. You cannot think how I thank God from my heart that He would not let me gratify the secret pride which was lurking in it, and which was stealing my heart from Him.’—(P. 3.) Here we must pause to doubt whether her music actually received all the commendation she fancied. It is not according to the common usage of society to lavish praise in this manner; but such reminiscences show a disposition naturally retentive of compliment, and making much of the commonplace civilities of society. Therefore we would have our young lady friends go on with their music in spite of such warnings as these, and try to play well too; for it is with music as with all other skill, ‘whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with all thy might.’ If they *weigh* the praise they get they will not value it too high; but, playing with taste and feeling, they will not need flattery to make the occupation pleasant. They will soon forget themselves in their art, and will be content too, as so many charming musicians of the domestic circle are daily content, to be forgot, by accustomed preoccupied listeners, whose nerves are soothed and tempers attuned to harmony by a process they are scarcely conscious of enough to analyse. Music, if regarded as a means of winning compliments, may be the ‘world;’ but cultivated, as it should be, for its own sake, and as simple-minded people pursue it, it is a foretaste of heaven. If Miss Newton

had kept up her music, we think her style would have been the gainer. This is the opening of one of her tracts:—

‘A SECRET.

‘I’ve just heard a bit of uncommon good news from Ireland; and in these times, when the plague is already begun among the people, I think it is a shame to keep it to myself. Everybody knows how bad the cholera is, and nobody can say that they mayn’t be the next to be taken with it; but everybody does not know *how to live through it*.

‘I’ve just heard of a ‘*Healer*,’ and if you like to know where He is I’ll tell you. The word ‘Jesus’ in Irish means ‘Healer,’ and Jesus is the most wonderful man for healing diseases that ever was heard of.’—P. 55.

If there were not several allusions to the good the authoress’s tracts actually effected, we should doubt the possibility of such familiar irreverence as this doing anything but harm (and we must still doubt it) to the reader, probably—to the writer, inevitably. The assumed vulgarity is, of course, in sympathy for the class for whom it was intended, who we cannot suppose would thank any young lady for forgetting her natural dialect and her education in consideration to their deficiencies. We have the less dependence on her ideas of sympathy with her inferiors, when we see what they are for her equals. It needs, in fact, what this school is especially without, the heart to be

‘At leisure from *itself*,
To soothe and sympathise.’

The predominant idea in their minds is to teach, that is, to make impressions, not receive them; the very opposite, it is evident, of the sympathetic temperament. Now, to take an instance, when a friend informs us he or she is just married, or about to be married, we ought to be passive recipients of that idea; our friend should have the glory of impressing us; but no fact can reach such busy minds as the one before us, without its suggesting something to be done, some impression to be made; so she hastens to respond to her friend’s communication, by changing the bearing of the subject to her own point of view, taking possession of it thus: ‘True, you are married; but your husband may die, and then where will you be?’ This is technically called *improving* the subject, and, undeniably, is an attempt to make an impression: though that death’s head was not likely to be wholly a stranger to the young bride, for

‘All pleasure is a fearful thing.’

‘Poor M—, on her becoming Mrs. —, once wrote to me so very strongly about the blessings of having at last one earthly friend to whom she could confide everything; and when I reminded her of the possibility of her losing that one earthly friend, and the blank which would then be felt, poor soul! she could not bear it.’—P. 83.

She was so ‘faithful’ to another friend on a similar occasion, that intercourse seems to have been discontinued, but such a

result does not give Miss Newton a moment's doubt as to the propriety of her own line of remark, as she seems to have felt herself rather great on this topic. Thus, to another more docile friend, she writes encouragingly:—

‘I am far from looking on marriage and love as trifling or *unsacred* subjects; they are designed of God amongst men, as I feel convinced, to set forth the love and marriage union of Christ to His Bride the Church, and are, or may be, sweet and holy earthly ties. But it has strongly been on my mind lately, that they are ties only for time. In heaven they neither marry nor are given in marriage. . . . It must be remembered constantly that the sweet enjoyments of mutual affections must be held in subordination to the lasting, ceaseless, pure, and unrestrained affection which, through time and eternity, must exist between the soul and Jesus. All that comes in subordination to THIS, dearest, I wish you,’ &c.—P. 63.

Mr. Baillie ushers in this sententious epistle with one of his flourishes: ‘She was no cynic, but rejoiced, like the Master, to ‘make all around her happy, delicately tempering congratulations with a seasonable admonition.’ A girl of three-and-twenty delicately seasoning her congratulations, at such a time, with admonitions, can only remind us of Malvolio’s familiar smile quenched with a severe regard of control; but it is singular how, at all ages, and under all circumstances, the disciples of this school refer all things back to themselves. Thus, *her* theory of the merely temporal nature of the union *might* annoy and could not interest or in any way concern her correspondent, and seems an incivility, while the good advice could scarcely be new to her. Such persons never give others credit for spontaneous thoughts; they must be infused by themselves or they will not be there at all.

How young people manage these matters amongst themselves is, it may be said, of small consequence to the world at large; and, no doubt, what young people, like the subject before us, think on abstract questions, is of little moment to any one, and their conduct in life only of importance to themselves and their immediate connexions; but when they are brought forward as examples, it is a different thing. So many more people admire goodness, than have practice and skill to discriminate between real goodness and assumption, that whenever they see zeal, devotion, and earnestness, they will be disposed to take everything for granted that accompanies those qualities, however much they may be marred and spoiled by individual or party errors: and, for their benefit, it cannot be amiss to analyse motives, and to trace out principles of action. Most of our readers would think it a serious matter if our young ladies, *en masse*, set themselves, after our present pattern, to decide who amongst their parents’ acquaintance were worldly, and who not; who must be summarily broken with, and who might be

retained; and thus turned every hearth into a seat of judgment on our neighbours. If they all agreed with Miss Newton that 'letter writing, only on ordinary subjects, is a sad waste of precious time, and very unpardonable amongst the Lord's people,' and that henceforth we must be no more cheered by the graphic liveliness of the female pen, but receive instead, from our wives, and sisters, and daughters, crude sermons, solemn warnings, vague confessions of sin, and long, confused, formulas of doctrine; if, finding it ministered to pride for them to amuse the family circle by their accomplishments, they left their elders, on principle, after the fatigues of the day, to their own resources, while they occupied themselves in the humbler duties of the pastoral office, or in the composition of tracts for unconverted sinners—it cannot be amiss, then, to prove that what would be so very inconvenient, irksome, and disagreeable, would not be good in *any* sense; that the truest Christian life does not interfere with the order of nature, nor give young people duties to perform for which their age and qualifications naturally unfit them; and that they cannot assume uncongenial occupations without injury to the simplicity and grace of their Christian character.

We have alluded to Miss Newton's ministerial labours, for her system of district visiting can go by no other name; she did not wait for opportunities for saying something seasonable on religious subjects, but she felt she was the appointed bearer of the Gospel message to each house, adding the stimulant of her interpretation of prophecy, which she found, and others with her, made them feel 'less concern and love for the world than anything we can imagine.' This supervision she kept up at a distance, by sending her own tracts ('Just as I am,' or a 'Shadow of Death,') and passages of Scripture for meditation, regretting that she had only 'spoken once faithfully' to so-and-so, rejoicing over others, and the like. Now, having a district implies that it was given her by her pastor, who trusted her to labour after her own manner in his parish. It strikes us that this confidence is not handsomely returned, either by the lady or Mr. Baillie, who, however, being what he is, is not likely to have much sympathy for an English parish priest, and probably is not unwilling to express his own feelings towards the body through the reflections of one of their flock in individual cases. So he takes care to record that these sisters were '*dreadfully starved* with their afternoon sermons,' one particular summer; of course those interested to know the preacher amongst them can easily compare dates, and find out who starved these ladies, who were certainly rather formidable members of a congregation, not only critical at the time, but causing their dissatis-

faction to be printed years after. But much worse follows, when, later in the volume, in 1852, we come upon the following impressions on listening to a sermon, while at her own home, and therefore we conclude at her own church :

‘Never can I forget yesterday’ (she writes, February 9, to Mrs. C—W—); ‘you can scarcely conceive what I felt, in the midst of what would otherwise have been a very good sermon from Mr. —, on the Spirit moving upon the face of the waters (Gen. i. 2), to hear him come out with the waters of baptism, while he strongly denied baptismal regeneration; yet to as strongly affirm that, where there was no conversion, there was still a great benefit conferred, by the doing away of original sin!!! This he also partly unsaid; but I really don’t know how, for I felt so stunned, that I retreated behind a pillar in the corner of the pew, and only entreated that the stream of deadly poison might not flow in through the congregation, and that the dishonour done to the BLOOD which alone can take away sin, might be forgiven. I don’t know what to do; it has wounded me to the quick. I feel, do you know, just as if I had been thrown into a dungeon, like Jeremiah, surrounded with filthiness, in this fallen world, from which there is no escape, till the word is given, “Come up higher!”’ —P. 271.

To this Mr. Baillie appends the insolent question, ‘Do Christian men, whose trumpet, in this matter, gives such uncertain sound, know how grievously they wound some of the holiest of the saints? It is no light matter to offend one of these little ones.’ So between the two, the hapless preacher comes off ill. We do not extract this for the sake of Miss Newton’s views on the subject of Baptism, nor of those of her pastor, nor yet for the petulance and arrogance apparent in the tone. Though a member of our Church in profession, we see that its spirit was throughout uncongenial to her, and that some of those to whom she looked mainly for instruction and sympathy were not of our communion.¹ Therefore our present comment is not because we find in the mind of this young lady no recognition of the fervent devotions of our Liturgy, nor acknowledgment of any kind to her appointed pastor, as such; for such a mind would naturally prefer choosing for itself, and would lean to ministers and ministrations in proportion as she had herself chosen them; but we notice this breach of decorum and good feeling as one instance out of very many within our own experience, as, we doubt not, within that of our readers, that turbid

¹ *E.g.* Take the following account of an occasional visitor. What sober English pastor could stand a chance with such exciting rivals? A visit which a Free Church minister, Mr. C—B—, had paid to her, she sketches thus:—‘I greatly enjoyed it, because he seemed so very happy in God and in His Lord. When he was up with me in this room, he appeared as if he could scarcely sit still sometimes for delight, especially when speaking of Psalm lxxxv. 10, “Righteousness and peace have kissed each other.” He clasped his arms and looked all he seemed, as if he would like to say of the exquisite beauty of God’s own joy in the perfection of his own attributes. It is impossible to put it into words; but perhaps the idea may strike your mind, as it did mine, in a way it never did before.’—P. 340.

enthusiasm, a chronic state of religious excitement, of whatever creed or party, does obscure the moral sense, blind people to the rules of common fairness and honesty, and unfits them for seeing the road of duty and honour in the intercourse between man and man. If it were not so, Mr. Baillie would not have had the *power* thus to publish private letters reflecting on private individuals, as we find him doing in his biographies.

But it is time to pass on to other works on our list. The transition can scarcely be called one from Mr. Baillie to Mr. Horatius Bonar, their intercourse and acquaintance seems so familiar, from the frequent recurrence of the names in one connexion, and the close accordance of their views. Their taste, too, in this chosen line of biography, is as similar as can well be, and their gratitude for the appreciation of admirers and converts prompts to the same profuse return in kind. But if Mr. Baillie is often extravagant in his own style, Mr. Bonar is no doubt far more extravagant in his subject, and in his indiscriminate praise of the most offensive peculiarities. The language of Mr. Hewitson, and, more frequently, of Miss Newton, has often made us feel the need of the Preacher's warning, 'God is in heaven, and thou upon earth, therefore let thy words be few,' while startled by the familiarity of that young lady's tone, the namby-pamby, affected homeliness of style, the 're-vellings' in Scripture, the 'nice texts,' with which she is 'so very much pleased,' the 'so delightful,' 'so sweet,' 'I like so very much;' the spiritual inquiries, 'Have you seen much of *Him* lately?' 'How are you getting on?' the very painful application of certain texts from the Canticles, on the confession, 'He (the Almighty) must often be intensely provoked with me,' and so forth. But this is all so much surpassed by Mr. Bonar's great example of piety, that we cease, as it were, to see irreverence anywhere else. With his 'Stranger Here,' this easiest familiarity is inseparable from the mention of our Blessed Lord at all. It does not taint her religion; it is her religion itself. We can only think of her, and of those who talk like her, as of the same fellowship with that rude multitude who thronged Him and pressed Him while He was still upon earth. But this is the feature in her religion which especially delights Mr. Bonar. Her real excuse is weakness and giddiness of mind. It is preposterous to have to review anything so trifling, so beyond the pale of rational discussion, as the greater part of the four hundred pages of this volume. But in excuse for noticing a work of so feeble a character, we can only say that it is *read*. Our copy is one of a third edition, and it is certain that people's critical acumen sleeps more in reading religious books than any other. Thoughts and feelings are more taken

for granted. It is supposed to be right and charitable to accept fervour in place of sense and propriety, and what would at once be detected as impertinence or futility if addressed to a creature, passes only for a spirituality beyond their powers of comprehension if addressed to the Maker and Sustainer of the Universe.

It is not indeed the unknown author of these effusions we wish to notice. Mr. Bonar, by publishing them, has made them his own; nor would he at all wish to shrink from the responsibility—he accepts them as exponents of his view of truth. What we object to as irreverent, strikes him as singularly fresh and real, as ‘natural and original even to simplicity,’ whatever that may mean; as possessing a tone of profound reality; as ‘produced ‘by the indwelling Spirit, and regulated by His in-working Hand.’ He rejoices in his convert, and is not a little proud of being the human motive power which put into action such a whizz and whirr of feeling, and talk, and excitement. He endeavours to introduce order and succession of time—to make out, in fact, the history of a mind out of the chaos of his materials—to give the impression of regular growth, and progressive development, to the uncertain fluctuations of an undisciplined fancy and feeble judgment. His history takes the following course, in the Table of Contents:—‘The Sleep of Death—The Awakening—‘The Rest—Trials and Joys—Progress in 1842-43—Conflicts—‘Labours and Longings—Progress in 1844-45—Features of a ‘Saint—Progress in 1846-47—Her last year.’

This list puts our readers as much in possession of the design of the book, as the volume itself would do; nay, more, for every page, from its stationary character, and resemblance in tone to the last, seems to set at nought the dignified order of the programme. To us, the whole book is the picture of a mind simply intoxicated by religious excitement, and stimulated and kept up to that state by the system in which she was first brought to think of religion at all. There is sincerity, and undoubted ardour of devotion; but the language in which all this is expressed is so absolutely contrary to all Scripture example or warrant, that we are sometimes forced to the conclusion, that the *object* of worship set before us by the same Scriptures must be wholly misunderstood by such minds; and that persons of this sort differ from the Christian Church as much in their views of the Supreme Being, as in their mode of addressing Him. To give an instance of what we mean—is there anything in Scripture to sanction the following mode of addressing and contemplating the Father and the Son? Can we trace any realizing the awfulness of the Divine Nature? Must it not be a truth hidden from a mind that could write in this strain, or approve it when written, ‘If I am a master, where is my fear?’ Can a true servant so forget

due reverence? But Mr. Bonar inserts this letter to a female friend, as a sign of *progress*. 'There is great singleness of heart,' he says, 'in these letters. They contain no reference to passing events, and even personal or domestic circumstances are only introduced in their bearings upon that eternity, towards which her eyes so intently and fervently turned. With what solemn steadfastness of purpose she pursued her heavenward path; with what zeal she laboured for her Lord; and with what willingness she bore His cross; the reader will discover in these letters, which mark her progress in the years 1844, 1845.'—P. 206.

'My very dear friend,—I have been long in answering your last sweet letter, but, since I received it, the chastening hand of my Father in Heaven has again been laid upon me; yet it was all in love, and I feel that I needed all He sent me, for I am very, very unlike any one of Jesus' dear "little ones," far less am I like Jesus Himself. You must pray, dear friend, that every sight that God gives me of my utter unworthiness may make Jesus more and more precious to me. I have been thinking much lately of this verse, "To them who believe, *He is precious*," and I long to be able to say He is precious to me. God has given me lately greater desires to know Jesus, and to feel His preciousness, and to feel my entire need of Him, and my entire dependence upon Him, than I have ever had, and I cannot doubt but that He will satisfy the desires He Himself has given. I feel my utter ignorance of Jesus, and His finished work, so much, I seem to know less about Him than I did at first; but one thing greatly rejoices me, and for that let us praise Him, that He is showing me, and making me *feel*, more than ever I did, *my need of Him*. I sometimes feel it so sweet, I cannot describe to you how sweet, to ask the Father to reveal the Son to me, *to tell me about Jesus*. I think *then* He will really smile upon me. I have very little joy, or even peace, just now; but sometimes God gives me such a desire to learn about Jesus, that the very desire is very, very sweet. I should wish to speak about Jesus with you, but everything I say seems like hypocrisy; and yet all I can say of *Him*, as being the loving One, is true, though I don't feel it so. Let us have a pen-and-ink talk about our Beloved, in spite of Satan and a cold heart. Can you always say, "*My Beloved?*" I still tremble to do it; but we need not fear when we think how kind, how gentle, how tender He is. "He can be touched with a feeling of our infirmities, for He was in all points tempted like as we are, *yet without sin*." Oh! I am so *very* glad He is without sin; if He had even one taint, we could have no hope. But is He not "the Lamb, without blemish and without spot?" Is He not the *Holy One* of God? Even the devils confessed that He was; and does not the Father (*His Father and therefore ours*) say of Him, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased?" and could God be well pleased with anything that was not perfectly holy? It is difficult to realize it. *We* are so unholy, we cannot understand how any one can be perfectly faultless; but let us be exceedingly glad that it is true, and also rejoice to know that when we shall see Him as He is, *we* shall be holy too; you, my beloved J—, and I, poor, sinful I, shall one day stand, *without fault*, before the throne of God. Isn't it wonderful? I shall be very glad when the journey is all over, for I cannot stand my earthliness any longer, it is so painful.'—*A Stranger Here*, p. 210.

In another place we find this extraordinary misgiving. 'Sometimes I think I am ungrateful to Jesus, in praying more to *my*

'*Father* than to Him, and it is curious, though I pray most to 'God, it is always Jesus I think of, and long to be with in 'heaven.'—P. 70.

Elsewhere we meet with the following views of a 'wonderful Christian':—

'I have been twice to see old Miss D——. She is a more wonderful Christian than ever. She said to me, "Satan has been telling me that the Bible is a fiction, and that Christ is a fiction, but I told him that He was a fiction only to Hell." And then she said, "Oh! Christ is a jewel! I am always asking to have that jewel!" We spoke about getting near Christ in heaven, and she said, "We shall each get a whole Christ and a whole throne to ourselves." She said, too, that there is a *war* in heaven; the redeemed tell each other their history; each says he is the greatest debtor; and then they always end with "Holy! holy! holy! is the Lord God Almighty!" She said that if we were oftener to tell one another what God has done for our souls, we too would end with, "Holy! holy! holy!"'—P. 211.

We ought to apologize for giving the dignity and durability of print to these profane ramblings, but the worst of making assertions is, that we must prove them; and though they were an old woman's ramblings in the first instance, their reproduction is deliberate and premeditated in Mr. Horatius Bonar. And as this wonderful Miss D—— lived in Kelso, the scene of Mr. H. Bonar's ministrations, and of the conversion of 'the Stranger here,' it is no violent supposition that she, Miss D——, gained her insight into mysteries from the lips of her pastor.

The subject of the present volume, after leading a careless, heedless girl's life, came to visit a religious friend at Kelso, expecting to be much worked upon, and resolved against any change. Her arrival coincided with 'a peculiarly refreshing and prayerful season.' Under Mr. H. Bonar's direction, 'souls were brought to peace in believing, and some awakened, besides 'God's people being quickened;' and though her case was known to be an 'unlikely and unhopeful one,' she was made the special object of prayer in these meetings. She went with her friend, though unwillingly, to an evening service, and her soul was troubled. On the following day Mr. Bonar called, but she was 'reserved in the extreme,' and her object was evidently to make the visit as disagreeable as possible. Still she went to the next Monday evening prayer-meeting, and in the midst of the address was so deeply smitten as to turn to one sitting next her, and exclaim (characteristically enough)—'What *does* the man mean?' On returning home from the meeting, she abruptly begged them 'not to suppose she cared for that man's words, for she was determined not to mind him.' Next morning she was unhappy; throughout the forenoon she was unsettled and uneasy, impatiently dashed down her pen, and declared she could not

even write to her mamma; and finally, the pent-up feeling bursting forth, she exclaimed, 'Oh! that man's words have done for me.' Her friend, eager to assist at this crisis, proposed reading the Bible, and read to her the greater part of the Song of Solomon, which happened then to be engaging her own thoughts. She wept very much, and seemed a little relieved, still recurring to the fact that that man had *done* for her. This expression, in its connexion with himself, greatly pleases Mr. Bonar, and probably is the reason of his 'delight in her peculiar style of expressing herself. 'She always took the word nearest at hand; hence the vigour and point of all she said.' Throughout the whole period of her rapid conversion the only symptom of self-righteousness (a stage which is looked for always till it is found) she manifested, was her preference of a small dark room, where she sat alone reading her Bible during the few days that elapsed before she 'found peace.' Her friend conversed with her. She had an interview with Mr. Bonar. She attended meetings and Bible-classes, and 'never showed any desire to return to the world;' only once, during this period, going to a dancing-party, and leaving it with a resolution never to return to such scenes. At length 'she got her eye upon the cross, and in seeing it, peace flowed in upon her.' On the 13th of June she heard the first sermon; on the 21st of July she is writing with fluency on the state of her feeling, and her new life was fairly set in.

We have given an abstract of the history of this conversion as it is told us, not doubting all its leading circumstances. The theory of Conversion, true or so-called, is too large a one for us to do more than touch upon it here, but one thing is clear with reference to all statements of this class. No amount of testimony, no startling suddenness of change, no consistency in that change, must allow us to relax the vigilance of our own judgment, nor to see evidence of a *Divine* illumination because wonderful phenomena are brought before us. We must appeal all the same to the law and to the testimony; we must judge by the fruits, by the spirit, and temper, and faith, that follow upon them, precisely the same whether the change is produced by slow, gradual, imperceptible conviction, or by the lightning's shock of what seems revelation. Every system that recognises excitement as a means, the most opposite the one from the other, has these conversions to boast of. Wherever the proselytising spirit is at work—wherever there exists in any body a longing earnest desire for others to join their body; whether through the purest charity or party spirit, there will these Divine (truly Divine) or material wonders take place; it needs the religious exercise of judgment to discriminate. And under the

most opposite systems, which cannot both be true, the course of the seeming miracle is often identical, as though some mysterious natural law were followed. Whoever is versed in the history of Roman Catholic conversions will recognise precisely the same course of events as we find in the history of Free Church revivals; the same *revelation*—it is believed without human interference—of the peculiar distinctive doctrines of each communion, in addition to, or often paramount to, those first principles of the Gospel which were the subjects of conviction in all the cases of conversion recorded in Scripture. Some natural, though mysterious, law of association must account for facts like these on one side or the other, unless we would flatly deny an immense amount of credible testimony. These general remarks are in reference to Mr. Bonar's use of the sudden change from indifference to ardent interest in the concerns of religion, in the case of the strange, weak, excitable being before us, as though he might claim from it a divine sanction and approval of the tone and language henceforth adopted by her. And there are many minds so unreasoning, that if they believe *at all* any part of the story of this 'conversion,' will think they see in it a warrant for the extravagances and improprieties that follow. But to return—as indeed we are conscious that this is scarcely a case to found general remarks upon.

All these books treat the subject of *souls*, and *sinner*s, and *conversions*, in a very technical manner. In the midst of all their zeal, a narrowness is manifest, as if realizing nothing beyond the acceptance of certain formula and the importance of bringing these *souls* to say certain things. But in the singular case before us, this pursuit of souls, and earnestness to win them, is carried on in so talkative and trifling a manner, as actually to degrade the effort to '*win*' them into a sort of spiritual *game*. Our own soul recoils at the prattle and chatter that is permitted and put forth for imitation on this subject; there is such a monstrous discrepancy between the vast momentous idea of an immortal soul brought into favour and communion with its Maker and Redeemer, and the frivolous, vain, and ignorant means set busily and confidently at work to produce this glorious and stupendous result. Mr. Bonar's prayer-meetings were apparently the head-quarters of all such intelligence, and the report of persons' spiritual progress circulated there in phraseology condensed for the initiated into a form unintelligible to the world without. The Correspondence is full of the same subjects; the progress of their acquaintance showing that so and so 'is very ignorant about God and eternal things,' and often says, 'he can't understand a thing,' or 'What a wonderful conversion I——'s has been,

without any fear or doubt;’ or again, ‘We met another child of Jesus to-day,—how old do you think? Ninety! She is a dear old body.’ By this lady souls in the abstract are discussed very much like counters. ‘My darling R. is gone for a month into the country. I hope the Lord will be with her, and enable her to win some souls where she is.’ (P. 212.) ‘I have got a district here. R., pray for me, that I may be enabled to speak to the people in it, and that, during the short time I am here, I may win some souls.’ (P. 216.) Again—‘You will be *obliged* to go to dear old Lizzy. Oh! I am so glad, you *must* win that soul, and I won’t be *jealous* if she is yours.’ (P. 226.) This Lizzy is often mentioned, and from her extreme docility and acquiescence in all that was told her, we are puzzled at the continued doubt concerning the poor old woman; it gives us a miserable insight into the mode in which the poor are worked upon by this class of chattering, babbling religionists. To follow the kind of teaching in this instance, and the utter unreality of the seeming test of success,—‘I have been with her about two hours to-day, reading and praying, and urging her to come to Jesus. She says she has been very miserable and anxious since I came to her, and that she is now much happier, and has no fear.’ (P. 218.) But in another letter we have the concise message, ‘Ask her from me if she can say, Abba, Father, yet?’ (P. 231.) And again—‘O that Lizzy would really come to Jesus; tell her from me that God is satisfied with his beloved Son, and that He requires nothing from her but just that she bring Jesus in her arms, and plead His name—she is sure to be accepted.’ (P. 237.) ‘Give my love to dear old Lizzy, and tell her that Jesus says, “Him that cometh unto me I will in no wise cast out.” I love her soul so much, but Jesus loves it far more. Let her choose Jesus this day, that she may serve Him.’ (P. 243.) And again,—‘Oh! tell her to delay no longer, but to come *now*, for all things are ready.’ (P. 247.) And last,—‘What do you think of old Lizzy? Tell her from me to beware of resting short of Christ. Perhaps God has sent you to speak the word to her that will be blest. Jesus walked till He was weary, just to convert one soul.’ (P. 250.)

There is a singular love of sporting at the edge of profanity in minds of this class; and especially in this poor lady, who must have been *encouraged* to follow out every outrageous fancy, as the Pythoness of old was stimulated into prophecy and oracles; we hesitate in transcribing some of her sentences, but Mr. Bonar extracts the first into his preface for its remarkable depth of spirituality. She is speaking of the Saviour’s love:—

‘I was so happy, so *very* happy. Oh, how I longed to share my joy with you! I wonder what gave me such delight; it was not any clear views of my interest in Christ; on the contrary, I never stopped to inquire! I

could not help rejoicing; and when Satan whispered that he would get me yet, I felt no alarm; indeed, the strangest thought came into my mind. I thought, Well, if I am lost, I will sit in a corner, and think about Jesus; and I actually felt as if I could be happy even there if I could think for ever about Jesus,' &c.—P. 6.¹

And the following incoherent aspirations she writes from home in the midst of her family:—

'I wish I could write you a letter full of Jesus; but oh! I have such a cold heart, and I know nothing of Him. I do long to know Him, to be intimately acquainted with Him! I long to be at home; this earth seems sometimes like hell. I cannot stand it; no one cares for God, or speaks of Him, or seeks to glorify Him. I wish Jesus was glorified. I should not care for myself, I think, if only He got the glory due to His holy and blessed name. I must live for Jesus, and I must live near Him, else this earth will indeed be a wilderness. R. and I had a very precious meeting last night. Jesus was very near; and oh, He was so loving, I felt as if I could not have any lean.'—P. 222.

She hears a sermon that pleases her, and thus easily describes the impression made upon her. 'It was all Jesus together; I

¹ This surely is a travesty of Bunyan's prison experience. When expecting to be hanged for his opinions, and assailed with doubts within, he thus powerfully describes the mental contest that tried his soul, and the final victory of faith.—

'Wherefore, when I first began to think of this, it was a great trouble to me; for I thought with myself, that in the condition I now was, I was not fit to die; neither indeed did I think I could, if I should be called to it; besides I thought with myself if I should make a scrambling shift to clamber up the ladder, yet I should either with quaking, or other symptoms of fainting, give occasion to the enemy to reproach the way of God and His people for their timorousness. This, therefore, lay with great trouble upon me; for methought I was ashamed to die with a pale face and tottering knees in such a case as this.

'Wherefore, I prayed to God that He would comfort me, and give strength to do and suffer what He should call me to. Yet no comfort appeared, but all continued hid. I was also at this time so really possessed with the thought of death, that oft I was as if I was on a ladder, with a rope about my neck. . . . Thus was I tossed for many weeks, and knew not what to do. At last this consideration fell with weight upon me. That it was for the word and way of God that I was in this condition, wherefore I was engaged not to flinch an hair's breadth from it.

'I thought, also, that God might choose whether He would give me comfort now, or at the hour of death; but I might not therefore choose whether I would hold my profession or no. I was bound, but He was free; yea, it was my duty to stand to His word, whether He would ever look upon me, or save me at the last; wherefore, thought I, save the point being thus, I am for going on, and venturing my eternal state with Christ, whether I have comfort here or no. If God doth not come in, thought I, I will leap off the ladder, even blindfold, into eternity; sink or swim, come heaven, come hell. Lord Jesus, if you wilt catch me, do; if not, I will venture for Thy name.'—Bunyan's *Grace Abounding*.

Much of this book is unquestionably the history of a state of mind bordering on insanity. Yet Bunyan is calm, reverent, and collected by the side of these wordy modern enthusiasts. But genius, and a sort of truth that these books are a stranger to, give a weight and continuity, reasonableness and moral value, to the treatment of any subject, however wild.

just wondered why everybody did not come to such a Saviour.' (P. 224.) She begins a letter: 'My dear R.,—I have taken a great longing to know more about our dear Redeemer.' But enough of this; every page presents similar passages; not one but is offensive, from the same cause. There is not one practical lesson, not one rational notion of duty, not one sober thought of temporal things, or one reverent idea of things eternal (that we have met with), throughout the whole book. After frequent longings for death, impatience of the burden of sin, weariness of this earth altogether, and longings for heaven, the lady *marries*, and settles in a country manse, but dies in her first confinement. Domestic matters are little entered into, beyond perpetual allusion to the unconverted state of most of the members of her own family, and the disunion consequent upon religious differences, and a uniform preference of Kelso, the grand scene of religious excitement to home, where she never thinks things are right, unless what she calls 'battles' are going on.

It is, we suspect, a new thing in professing Christians to be wholly careless in their *style* of expressing themselves on sacred subjects, and in supposing there is merit in this indifference. A useful barrier is broken down when pains and deliberation in the choice of words are despised. For our part, we do not see that a little ceremony even comes amiss when the court of the King of kings is approached. Serious thoughts indeed *cannot* clothe themselves in careless language; but a great deal of religion is not serious, and this fact comes out in this whole class of books, and it is a point to be dwelt upon; for what is that religion worth which does not make men less frivolous than they were before, but only frivolous on more solemn and momentous matters. Then indeed the very salt has lost its savour, and wherewith shall we season it?

The religion of the last century contrasts favourably, in this particular point, with a large share of the popular piety of our own time. No one then was careless or familiar. Sententious, prosy, merely moral, and dry, they might be, and often were, but the inborn awe and fear of God as our Maker, a deep sense of a superintending Providence—that natural religion, in short, which no revealed religion was ever designed to supplant, is apparent throughout. The Unity of the Godhead is an actuating doctrine, which it is *not* in any system of religious excitement, where the precious doctrines of grace are taught exclusively, and not as part—though that part is the crowning glory—of God's revelation of Himself to man. In that darker age their religion was often vague, and their creed ill-defined; but at least there was no chatter about theology, no bandying to and fro of the most sacred terms, as if they were subjects

for common gossip. They held religion to be a calm, grave, sedate, and reverential influence; and therefore, when they wrote of it, they formed their sentences with care, that no hurry or impertinence of language should misrepresent or profane this idea.¹ As a contrast to the hasty scribbling, the pretences of knowing the Divine mind as they would guess at the thoughts of a friend, the 'jottings down,' as they are affectedly called, of crude thoughts set down pell-mell in ostentatious confusion, a little of the formal divinity and precise biography of a past age makes very pleasant reading; all the more for the latter being much more comprehensive and conscientious in its matter than these ultra-spiritual lives ever are, and giving the reader altogether a truer and more ingenuous picture of the whole man.

¹ There were female religious writers of the period of which we speak, and the same deliberate care, the same respectful attention to style—that sentiment which dictates a stately propriety of dress in the presence of royalty—is apparent in them. They always wrote as well as they could, and would have been ashamed to do otherwise, to be betrayed by haste and inconsiderateness to a mean, or familiar, or intemperate mode of expression. Take for example the following measured, carefully weighed, and often musical sentences, forming the greater part of a farewell letter from a lady to her friend—a composition, we think, as remarkable for recollection of spirit and Christian hope and confidence, on the very verge of the grave, as for elevation of style. It was written about 1735.

'To the Rt. Hon. the Countess of Hartford.

'Madam. . . . I am now taking my farewell of you here, but 'tis a short adieu, for I die with full persuasion that we shall meet again. But oh, in what elevation of happiness! in what enlargement of mind, and perfection of every faculty! What transporting reflections shall we make on the advantages of which we shall feel ourselves eternally possessed. To Him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in His own blood, we shall ascribe immortal glory, dominion, and praise for ever. This is all my salvation, and all my hope. That name in whom the Gentiles trust, in whom all the families of the earth are blessed, is now my glorious, my unfailing confidence; in His merits alone I expect to stand justified before infinite purity and justice. How poor were my hopes if I depended on those works which my own vanity or the partiality of men have called good, and which, if examined by Divine purity, would prove perhaps but specious sins? The best actions of my life would be found defective, if brought to the test of that unblemished holiness in whose sight the heavens are not clean. Where were my hopes but for a Redeemer's merits and atonement?—how desperate and undone my condition! With the utmost advantage I can boast I should start back, and tremble at the thoughts of appearing before the unblemished majesty. O Jesus, what harmony dwells in Thy name? Celestial joy and immortal life are in the sound. Let angels set Thee to their golden harps; let the ransomed nations ever magnify Thee!

'What a dream is mortal life! What shadows are the objects of sense! All the glories of mortality, my much beloved friend, will be nothing in your view at the awful hour of death, when you must be separated from the whole creation, and enter on the borders of the immaterial world.

'Something persuades me that this will be my last farewell in this world. Heaven forbid that it should be an everlasting parting! May that divine Protection, whose care I implore, keep you steadfast in the faith of Christianity, and guide your steps in the strictest paths of virtue. Adieu, my most dear friend, till we meet in the paradise of God.

• 'ELIZABETH ROWE.'

We now turn to a little book emanating from one who has evident sympathies with the same school, but yet forming a most agreeable contrast to the works previously discussed. The memorials of Captain Hedley Vicars, drawn from various sources, show a really attractive, and in its way charming character, though we own it is not *our* way in every respect. It is the history, or rather sketch, of a young soldier, in the various stages of his course, from the thoughtlessness of his youth to the ardent enthusiasm of later years, and the earnest practical religion which sustained him through all the trials of the Crimean winter, in noble unselfish devotion to his duties—duties which to him had a very comprehensive range, until his career was suddenly cut short by a hero's death, as he led his men on to the charge. The sketch is by some loving hand, liking him altogether too well to be able to assume the cold forbidding tone of the professional pen, though no doubt respecting that style in others; delighting in his natural character *always*; seeing something amiable in his natural warmth of feeling, something consolatory in his natural remorse at the errors of a very thoughtless, and, probably, much worse than thoughtless, youth, in the midst of all the temptations incident to his profession. She—for there are clear indications of a female hand—is proud of his constitutional good-nature, his cheerfulness, his manly bearing, his high courage, his unselfishness, and has pleasure in giving traits of such qualities; and the effect is that we have a real picture, and a very attractive one, even to those who cannot always sympathise with his tone in speaking and writing on spiritual subjects, and who feel something uncongenial and grating to their feelings in his utter unreserve in the mode of expressing his own convictions and personal experience in sacred things, continually, on every occasion, before the least sympathising audience. But it is quite fit that we should realize that there are differences of temperament that *must* result in wide differences in action; and wherever a course of conduct is natural, the spontaneous consequence of nature and disposition, there we must make the most ample allowance for any divergence from our own standard. Many of Captain Vicars' isolated acts bear a close resemblance to acts of Mr. Hewitson and these ladies of his school whose spirituality has been paraded before us by their eulogists; but with him these acts are not efforts, not self-conscious performances, but parts of himself, exhibitions of his peculiar open, unembarrassed, somewhat off-hand temper, finding a very congenial home in the religious school to which he naturally belonged when he began to be religious at all.

As is the case with most persons, we suspect, who are very

demonstrative in their manifestation of religious feeling, who find it easy to say all they think, and are unvisited by the timidity and reserve which restrain, as with bands of iron, so many deep, thoughtful minds, when they are expected to talk of what they feel, Captain Vicars had an undisciplined childhood. His father was abroad on military duty, and he was, therefore, brought up by his mother, with whom he seems to have been able to do pretty much as he pleased, the only apparent check being his own warm, tender, constant affection, influencing him for good throughout his whole course: 'To study he showed a marked and positive aversion,' but was great in all school sports and pranks, and a favourite with his schoolfellows. In 1843, when he was seventeen, he received a commission in the Line. The news reached his mother, we are told, on Christmas-day, by the same hand which, twelve years after, on Good Friday, informed her how faithfully unto death that commission had been fulfilled. He soon joined the *dépôt* of the 97th regiment, and threw himself with characteristic ardour into all the duties of his profession, to which he was devoted from first to last.

His eldest sister well remembers his joyous bearing as he first exhibited himself to them in the Queen's uniform, and her own admiration of the bright, intelligent countenance, broad shoulders, and well-knit, athletic figure of her young soldier brother. A few weeks afterwards he sailed for Corfu—now fairly launched in the world and in a profession beset with temptations.

He still retained the frank demeanour and kind and generous disposition which had distinguished him as a boy, with a keen relish for adventure, and a quick perception of the beautiful in all around him, as his descriptions of scenery sufficiently show. Gifts are these, lovely in themselves, but dangerous, often fatal, to their possessor, as the wrecks upon many a shoal of life too truly testify.

He had a pleasant and prosperous voyage out; with his usual activity lending a helping hand to the sailors in the work of the ship, and winning their hearts by his genial manners. At Corfu he entered with spirit into all the amusements which offered themselves to him. His letters to his family were now less frequent than ever before or afterwards, and at this period of his life his reckless disposition often led him into scenes of which his conscience disapproved, and to excesses which, though never matured into habits, and, by the grace of God, early and for ever abandoned, were afterwards the subject of bitter and humiliating remembrance. In reference to this he wrote in 1854, "You will be spared poignant remorse in after years by remembering your Creator in the days of your youth. I speak from heartfelt experience. I would give worlds, if I had them, to undo what I have done."—*Memorials of Captain Hedley Vicars*, pp. 7—9.

He remained there about two years, and then was ordered with his regiment to Jamaica. From Maroon Town he thus writes to his mother, on hearing of her dangerous illness:—

"I see it all now. It is I that have caused your illness, my darling mother. Ever since the receipt of your last letter, I have been in a dreadful

state of mind. I feel that I deserve God's severest punishment for my ~~undutiful~~ conduct towards the fondest of mothers, but the excruciating thought had never before occurred to me, that He might think fit to remove her from me. Oh, what agony I have endured! what sleepless nights I have passed, since the perusal of that letter! The review of my past life, especially the retrospect of the last two years, has at last quite startled me, and at the same time disgusted me. You will now see the surest sign of repentance in my future conduct; and believe me, that never, as far as in me lies, shall another moment's anxiety be caused you by your dutiful and now repentant son."

'The remorse which he thus affectingly expresses, was caused by his having incurred debt, to no great amount, but such as he knew would become a burden to a widowed mother. During his residence in one of the Mediterranean isles, he had become acquainted with a family who showed him great hospitality, and in maintaining social intercourse with them, and sharing their pleasures, he had involved himself beyond his means. It was the first and the last time that his unselfish nature thus transgressed.

'In the depth of his penitence for his errors towards an earthly parent,—called forth by the patient bearing of her forgiving love,—do we not see the foreshadowing of that prostration of soul with which he humbled himself, when once the kindness and long-suffering of his God and Saviour were manifested to him in the fulness of redeeming love? And thus it was first through the raising of his moral nature, by means of the holiest affections of man's heart, that he was eventually, after many a fall and rising again, to be drawn up into the higher life of fellowship with the Father and with his Son Jesus Christ.'—Pp. 13, 14.

For the three years he remained in the West Indies his life was one of habitual carelessness and deadness to religion, with occasional impulses to better things, caused by any startling event in the scenes around him, reminding him of death and eternity. His letters to his mother and sisters express these feelings, and give pretty descriptions of his cottage, flowers, and poultry, with which he amused himself in his hours of leisure. During this time, by the strictest economy, he paid all the debts (not considerable) that weighed on his mind, writing at one time to his mother: 'In a short time, dear mother, your son will be entirely out of debt; hurrah!' But all this time he totally neglected prayer and the reading of the Bible; so much so, that for five years at this part of his life, he did not possess a Bible, having lost that which his mother gave him, at Corfu: and even when aroused to the duty of *having* a Bible, the one he bought was of so indistinct a print, that he seldom read it. But the time arrived for a total change of thought and habit.

'It was in the month of November, 1851, that, whilst awaiting the return of a brother officer to his room, he idly turned over the leaves of a Bible which lay on the table. The words caught his eye, "The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin." Closing the book, he said, "If this be true for me, henceforth I will live, by the grace of God, as a man should live who has been washed in the blood of Jesus Christ."

'That night he scarcely slept, pondering in his heart whether it were presumptuous or not to claim an interest in those words. During these

wakeful hours he was watched, we cannot doubt, with deep and loving interest, by One who *never* slumbereth nor sleepeth; and it was said of him in heaven, "Behold, he prayeth!"

In answer to those prayers, he was enabled to believe, as he arose in the morning, that the message of peace *was* "true for him,"—"a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptance." "The past," he said, "then is blotted out. What I have to do is, to go forward. I cannot return to the sins from which my Saviour has cleansed me with His own blood."

An impetus was now given in a new direction, of sufficient force to last till the race was run—until he could say with the Apostle Paul, "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith." Thenceforth *he lived*. And the life he now lived in the flesh, he lived by the faith of the Son of God, of whom he delighted to say, with realizing faith and adoring gratitude, "He loved me, and gave Himself for me."

On the morning which succeeded that memorable night, he bought a large Bible, and placed it open on the table in his sitting-room, determined "that an open Bible," for the future, should be "his colours." "It was to speak for me," he said, "before I was strong enough to speak for myself." His friends came as usual to his rooms, and did not altogether fancy the new colours. One remarked that he had "turned Methodist," and, with a shrug, retreated. Another ventured on the bolder measure of warning him not to become a hypocrite: "Bad as you were, I never thought you would come to this, old fellow." So, for the most part, for a time, his quarters were deserted by his late companions. During six or seven months he had to encounter no slight opposition at mess, "and had hard work," as he said, "to stand his ground." But the promise did not fail, "The righteous shall hold on his way, and *he that hath clean hands* shall wax stronger and stronger."

All this time he found great comfort in the society of a few brother officers who were walking with God, but especially in the faithful preaching of the Gospel of Jesus Christ by Dr. Twining, Garrison Chaplain at Halifax, and in the personal friendship of that man of God, which he enjoyed uninterruptedly from that time until the day of his death. Under so deep an obligation did he consider himself to Dr. Twining, that he frequently referred to him as his spiritual father; and to his scriptural preaching and teaching, and blessed example of "walking with God," may doubtless be traced, under the mighty working of the Holy Spirit, those clear and happy views of religion and that consistency and holiness of life which succeeded his conversion.—Pp. 32—34.

From this time his zeal knew no intermission. He began to teach in the Sunday-school, to visit the sick, and to read and pray with the soldiers singly. And over these he seems always to have exercised great influence for good. The adjutancy of his regiment was offered him at this time, with the flattering compliment from his Colonel, that he could best trust him with responsibility, and the appointment was popular in the regiment, except that one objected to him as 'too conscientious.' His letters home all enlarge on his change of feeling, but their tone has a reality that such letters often want. Thus, in general confessions of sin we are often, in others, painfully struck by their merely theological character; they are more statements of the doctrine of human depravity than an

individual sense of *guilt*; they only amount, whatever the extreme language used, to the formula, 'All men are bad. I find in myself, being by grace brought to a clear insight into my condition, symptoms of the general evil.' But here the tone is different. He is conscious of something special in himself, making him feel *worse* than others. Thus, writing to his sister:—

"What I pray for most constantly is, that I may be enabled to see more clearly the wicked state of my heart by nature, and thus to feel my greater need of an Almighty Saviour. You cannot imagine what doubts and torments assail my mind at times, how torn and harassed I am by sinful thoughts and want of faith.

"You, Mary, can never experience my feelings, for you know not in what a sinful state my life has been passed." Well may I call myself the 'Chief of sinners.'"—P. 37.

And, writing to his brother—though, probably, some of the 'amusements' he denounces in another part, as incompatible with a religious life, were harmless in themselves, and he had not learnt to distinguish between things positively sinful, and others only evil if misused; and made the business of life, instead of an occasional relaxation—his tone is natural and sincere:—

"As Newton says, 'I know what the world can do, and what it can not do.' It cannot give or take away that peace of God which passeth all understanding. It cannot soothe the wounded conscience, nor enable us to meet death with comfort. I have tried both services. For twenty-four years have I lived under the thralldom of sin, led by the Devil. None need despair of being welcomed by the Saviour, when He has pardoned and brought to repentance such a sinner as I have been. The retrospect of my past life is now miserable to me; yet, before I was taught by the Spirit of God, I thought and called it a life of *pleasure*! The very name, when applied to sin, now makes my heart sick. Even then I never could enjoy recalling the occupations of each day; and think you my conscience was quiet? No, though again and again I stifled it, as too many do. Bitter experience has taught me that 'there is no peace to the wicked.' Blessed be God, I know now that I am pardoned and reconciled to God, through the death of his Son. How happy is the Christian's life, when he has this assurance!

"Do not think, dear Edward, that because I write thus, I wish you to think me very religious, or that I consider myself better than you. I do not. But I find more pleasure now in writing on these subjects than on any other, and I want to draw out your thoughts about them. If you have not yet turned entirely to God, take my advice, and if you want to find true happiness, do so at once."—Pp. 41, 42.

Whether it was *natural* to him to begin to write a diary, we do not know; but he, probably, thought it necessary to a good profession, and there are some few pages devoted to extracts from his. This style of composition is in its nature so unreasonable—as we understand it,—it must be so very difficult to write to our own selves, about our spiritual condition, with any ease or pro-

priety—absolute truth and sincerity are so unattainable in the business of telling one part of our being what the other part of us knows—it must be felt at the time to be so fallacious an instrument for testing progress, and must seem such a wasted and unthankful labour, if really and truly designed for one's-self *alone*, with a stern resolution that no other eye shall see it, that we cannot enter into the meaning or design of the system at all, except perhaps as a substitute for confession, for which 'frames' of mind, mere elevations and depressions of feeling, are no fit subject. We have called it thankless labour, if persons write only for themselves; nor is it less so, if these private diaries, either by the connivance of the writers, or against their intention, ever reach the public. We believe there is the stamp of uselessness and barrenness upon them; that they are essentially a mistake; that, beyond the facts and incidents which they embody, and which are not of the essence of the thing at all, they are simply curious phenomena, which must be regarded—the best and most sincere of them—not as useful to direct edification, but as a page of human nature, for those who are interested in that study. Captain Vicars' mind was not *curious* or intricate enough to afford matter for such students. His record of impressions is generally concise enough. Aug. 9th. 'In a happy frame of mind all day,' &c. Aug. 10th. 'Had happy thoughts of Jesus,' &c. 16th. 'Still in a torpid state of mind,' &c. 23d. 'My mind more tranquil during the day,' 24th. 'My mind more composed to-day than usual,' &c., with now and then little confessions and practical rules of more value:—

"I must have a regular system of reading the Scriptures every day. Psalm in the morning, Gospel in the afternoon, and Epistle in the evening. Did wrong in the evening in laughing at poor —. I must give up teasing him, for it is unchristian-like. O God! give me thy Holy Spirit to enable me to overcome this habit.

"26th.—I begin to see more clearly every day the depravity of my heart, and my own utter inability to turn to God of myself. At the class, in the evening, about fifteen. I went to Dr. Twining's afterwards. Spoke ill naturally of one or two. I would that I could do two things—never speak abt at myself, and never speak evil of any one."—P. 57.

Some reflections there are which strike one as set down because something *must* be said, such as—

"October 29th.—Remained in bed till eight o'clock. *Must* give up this slothfulness. Had no time to read my chapter till twelve o'clock, all owing to love of sleep. At mess scarcely any thoughts of Jesus; slight symptoms of a desire to return to the world and sin.

"November 5th.—Rose at seven o'clock. Would that I could fix my waking thoughts on Jesus! How few are the moments I think of Him to those in which I forget Him! Walked with Desmond and Nash. Kirby

wrote me a letter thanking me for bringing him back to trust in Jesus. He talks of his sins. Little does he know the sinner he talks to,

“15th.—Arose at seven. A few thoughts of Jesus whilst dressing. I would that I had a heart more entirely set on things above! What a body of sin I carry about! Received the reports of the Mic-mac Missionary Society—rather proud at seeing my name in the list of subscribers. When shall I conquer this detestable pride? When shall I look upon myself as the vilest of sinners, as indeed I am?

“16th.—At the class offered up a few ejaculatory prayers to Him who seeth in secret. Walked out with Dr. Twining,—spoke very profitably together about our precious Saviour.”—Pp. 59, 60.

However, the extracts are all from within a period of ten months, so that probably the diary afterwards degenerated into a simple record of events, which we suspect wise men's journals generally are.

He returned to England in May, 1853, and there ensued a very happy period, lasting just a year, of home, and intercourse with intimate, congenial friends, whose views were in close accordance with his own, and who were circumstanced to give life and development to his energies. He visited the poor, devoted himself to many spiritual labours, made speeches and addresses, especially worked amongst the ‘navvies’ engaged upon the Crystal Palace, of whom he was led to see much, while visiting Dr. Marsh and his family, at Beckingham. There was in all this happy, exciting period, a fervour of zeal, of family affection, of friendship, ripening, in one case, into the closest of all ties. A fine, frank, warm-hearted young soldier, ardent in his piety, enthusiastic in all his undertakings, expansive in his benevolence; with manners easy, winning, and cordial to his equals, and gracious to his inferiors, was sure to create a great impression; and there does seem to have been a general effusion of heart, leading to much natural excitement on all hands. We get almost confused amidst the multitude of his avocations, and calls upon his time and energies. The prayer-meetings, cottage addresses; the sick poor visited and prayed with, in hospitals and at their own homes; the public meetings, of all sorts, at Exeter Hall and elsewhere; the family gatherings, the old recognitions, and new friendships, the letters of counsel, and encouragement, and instruction, with warnings against Popery, and the like. It was the very acmé of religious activity and bustle, both public and private. There are indications of much which, told more in detail, we could not sympathise with. He was led to talk of himself, in his addresses to the ‘navvies,’ a practice about which, however, he had always misgivings, and, in one instance, certainly not without grave reason. We are satisfied that no good could result from telling a set of rough labourers acts of his own previous reckless and wild life. Indeed we are a little surprised at the cool way in which the following is

recorded, illustrative, certainly, of the length to which practical jokes are carried in the army:—

‘A large number of young men, chiefly navvies, were present that evening, and, at our request, he told them the story of his conversion. To illustrate the recklessness of his life before that great change took place, he mentioned, amongst other acts of useless and even sinful daring, that when he was in the West Indies, at the time the cholera was raging, he and one brother officer determined to punish another for being afraid of it.

“Let us put him into a coffin!” said Hedley. No sooner spoken than acted upon. A row of coffins stood at the hospital door. Undeterred from their reckless purpose, by finding one after another filled by a silent occupant, they at last succeeded in their object.

‘The companion of Hedley Vickers in this sinful practical joke was seized with cholera shortly afterwards; but, by God’s forbearing mercy, he was spared for better things.

‘At the close of his address, he turned round, and said to me, with characteristic frank simplicity, “I am sorry you asked me to speak of myself; one is afraid of being proud even in speaking of one’s sins!”—
Pp. 135, 136.

The joke was really a brutal one, and there is danger in allowing rude minds to associate such acts, for which they have too much zest already, with names and persons they respect. They were not in a condition to be very much shocked with anything Captain Vickers could ever have done, and would only see less harm in such an outrageous proceeding than it deserved. But it is easy to understand how one of his temperament might be betrayed into ill-judged confessions of this kind, urged on as he no doubt was by admiring, sympathising friends, who had clearly great faith in the efficacy of religious excitement.

But now another scene was to open upon him. The war broke out, and the 97th was ordered to be in readiness, and eventually sailed for Greece. The parting was a sad one to many, and he himself seems to have had a presentiment of his end; though this, after all, only means that he knew he was entering upon scenes of extreme danger, for the feeling, as it generally does, gave place to hope, when on the actual scene of conflict.

‘On the evening of Wednesday the 17th, he attended the first public Meeting in Exeter Hall, for the Soldiers’ Friend Society, in which he was warmly interested. Some of his men were also present.

‘He found time for the service of God, and for promoting the interests of His kingdom upon earth, without neglecting any of the last obligations of friendship before his final parting, and whilst occupied, almost from morning till night, in arranging and providing for the wives and children of the soldiers of the Light Company.

‘The order had come for the embarkation of his regiment on Friday in that week. The fulfilment of an old promise was now claimed by him, that we should meet him at Waterloo Station, and cheer him with a last “God bless you!” there.

‘But, on Thursday afternoon, he sent a note by express, to say that they had just received orders to leave London at six o’clock; and that much as

he had rested on the promise of this last Act of friendship in England, he could not request its fulfilment, as the hour was so early.

‘It need not be said, that the hour was of no moment to those who loved him. By six o’clock we drove up to the Waterloo Station.’

‘It was a lovely morning, that 19th of May. The sunshine, glittering on the bayonets of the men, as they marched up the steps to the station, seemed to mock the tears of wives, sisters, and friends, who accompanied them.

‘I saw a young wife quit her hold of her husband’s hand, and approach Hedley Vicars, with a manner of respectful confidence, as she said to him, “Oh, Mr. Vicars, you will see that Cottrell writes to me *regular*, won’t you? It is my only comfort to know that you will.”

‘The kindness and sympathy of his tone, as he answered her, told that her confidence was not misplaced.

‘Just then his brother arrived; and during the delay which followed before the train started, we read the 121st Psalm in the waiting-room. I remember the deep well of quiet confidence in his eye, as the words were repeated to him, “The Lord is *thy* keeper.”

‘There was something in the tone of his voice that day which struck like a distant knell upon our hearts. It was a foreboding tone. However strongly hope may have sprung up afterwards, we felt at that moment that it was our last parting.’—Pp. 148—150.

The object of their stay in Greece was to form an Anglo-French force there, for ‘the purpose of bringing King Otho to his senses.’ It proved a disastrous encampment, for the cholera broke out among our troops, and in the space of thirty-four days, the 97th lost a hundred and twenty of its best men. It was no part of the officers’ duty to attend in the hospitals, but here Captain Vicars’s unselfish qualities and high sense of duty shone out. A brother officer thus described him at this period.

“‘I was constantly with Vicars there, and know what his daily life was better, perhaps, than any one else. But about that, it is difficult to say more, than that he never for a moment seemed to forget ‘whose he was.’ When we were in camp, on first landing, he was in the habit of going out alone for hours amongst the rocks on the sea-shore, having only his Bible, which, I remember his telling me, Dr. Marsh called ‘his sword.’

“‘As you know, of course, there was no Chaplain for the English troops there. The Chaplain attached to the English Legation at Athens came over to the Piræus at first to perform a short service in one of the barrack rooms, but as soon as the sickness broke out he was not allowed to come. Part of the service was generally read, on Sunday, by the officers to the men of their own companies; and the officers, in rotation, took the duty, morning and evening, of burying the dead, which sometimes, of our English regiment only, exceeded ten daily. Hedley Vicars undertook this duty several times for others, and seldom, *if ever*, performed it without adding a few earnest words to the men present. Soon after the sickness broke out, he used regularly to visit the hospitals, reading and praying with the dying men, and taking every opportunity of speaking of the ‘one thing needful’ to others. In these visits to the hospitals he was sometimes accompanied by two or three of his brother officers, one of whom, Major Colville, has since died in the Crimea.

“‘With all his zeal he was ever careful to avoid giving offence. I have known him to erase passages which seemed to speak harshly of Roman Catholics from tracts he was about to distribute generally amongst the men.

Much as he abhorred Popery, he had the greatest tenderness for the feelings of Roman Catholics. His constant sympathy and kindness for all, of any creed, and whether officers or men, is not easily to be described. When others were depressed, he was always hopeful. His spirits were hardly ever cast down.

"All these things you must have heard from others. The most remarkable thing about him—his great consistency of life and conversation, with his entire devotion to the one cause ever set before him—I seem to be unable to put into words."—Pp. 170—172.

His own letters tell the tale at greater length, but we have not space. It was by services such as these that he won the hearts of his men, who would all do anything for him. He kept his health in the midst of the general sickness, and in constant attendance night and day at the hospital; and when advised to seek change of air at Pentelicus, 'certainly would not leave' till the cholera was over. He seems to have been chaplain too, all the time, for there was no other. After remaining at the Piræus from June to November, they embarked for the Crimea; a change which he had been longing for, having a soldier-like desire to be 'let loose at the Russians.' The horrors of sickness he had witnessed in Greece were only a preparation for the greater horrors of that dreadful winter campaign into which he was now plunged, and where the same singular unselfishness and Christian fortitude were shown.

'During the severe cold of that winter, the only bed he allowed himself was made of stones and leaves, until a fur rug arrived from England, which he felt was invested with a kind of claim of friendship to be retained for his own use. Everything else which could bear the name of luxury, or even of common comfort, was given to the deeper necessities of the suffering soldiers.'

'Towards the end of November, he was in command of an outpost, which was not only an important position, open to the attack of the enemy, but was also a picquet, furnished by the 97th. On either side of it were hills, covered with stunted brushwood: in front was a ravine, leading to Sebastopol. Here, by day, a subaltern was in command of fifty men; by night, the captain on duty with fifty more. The first force was then sent up to a cave on the left of the ravine, where a breastwork had been thrown up. For nearly three weeks, the party defending the outpost had to sleep in the open air, or at best under roofing made of bushes, through which the wind and rain freely penetrated. At length, however, two tents were pitched,—one for the company, the other for its officer. Hedley gave up his own tent to his men, and continued to rough it in the open air, considering himself more hardy than many of them.'

'There is in many of his letters at this time a singular combination of almost apostolic devotedness and love, with the gallant ardour of the soldier—leading to an almost boyish anticipation of "a brush with the Russians."—Pp. 211, 212.

His letters, without any design to raise compassion, indeed making as light as possible of the hardships of that time, bear out all that has been said of its misery and desolation. His letters from the Crimea improve in intelligence and interest. Hitherto they have been too much on the subject of religion to be really

letters at all, but now they give news, they contain anecdotes, and express natural feeling, as well as always a hearty, cheery courage, and a deep-seated faith, which impresses the reader more because it is not always on the tip of the pen. How many hearts, like his, were warmed by thoughts of love and home; how many dreams like this may have been dreamt on those snowy heights.

"I have the tent to myself to-night, Brinkley being on duty in the trenches. It is curious what delightful dreams I have every time I fall asleep: now I am at Terling, surrounded by all your beloved faces; then again at Beckenham, with those I love so dearly; at another time I am going to read to old Sophy; again, sitting by the blazing fire in the drawing-room, telling tales of the war to dear John; and awake to find my teeth chattering in my head, a sharp stone sticking into my side, the wind howling in gusts and squalls, and a concert of cannon and small shot, with variations from English, French, Turkish, and Russian performers, instead of a chaunt in the hall."—P. 221.

And in another letter:—

"I had begun to fear before I left the Piræus that something was wrong; but you would have felt with me that it was worth while to have had the suspense, if you could have seen me whilst I was reading those precious letters on my arrival here (besides my budget from Terling). My heart and arm are nerved *now*, and I am utterly indifferent to hardships or external trials of any kind . . . It is six months since I have been within reach of a house of prayer, or have had the opportunity of receiving the Sacrament; yet never have I enjoyed more frequent or precious communion with my Saviour than I have found in the trenches or in my tent. When, I should like to know, could one find a Saviour more precious than when bullets are falling around like hail?"

'Ten days later he gives an account of "such a happy Sabbath," and speaks of his thankfulness in receiving the sacrament of the Lord's Supper after having been so long deprived of it:—"I am delighted to say we had twenty officers there. I like what I have seen of the chaplain to our division, Mr. Parker, very much. He has hard work indeed, but seems to love it, because it is the service of Christ Jesus."—Pp. 225, 226.

Of all the miseries in the trenches, in the hospitals, in watching, weariness, rain and cold, and sometimes even hunger, he had his full share, which he bore in a perfectly contented and unrepining spirit, except that he shared the general longing to have 'a brush with the Russians,' instead of seeing his men melting away from the effects of mere hardship:—

"The nights are very cold now, and that dear fur rug, when it arrives, will be most acceptable indeed. I will not disguise from you the truth, that we have to endure days and nights of hardships; but what are soldiers meant for? I *willingly* submit to them, and would to greater. Yet I cannot but feel, and deeply too, for the death of so many of my comrades; but I keep hope alive in my heart that many amongst them *died in Jesus* at the last. He is so tender and loving a Saviour, and so willing to hear poor sinners when they cry unto Him, that I believe He will not turn a deaf ear to the faintest sigh of a broken and contrite heart that may mount upwards to the mercy-seat, even from the soldier who has longest trampled on His love and forbearance. I cherish this hope, and will, as long as I live.

"Whenever I am off duty, I visit the tents of the sick. They are full

again, although forty were sent to Balaklava a few days ago. The weather is very wet and damp, with snow every now and then; but I am, thank God, as safe and sound as ever I was in my life. I feel persuaded that the Lord is keeping me for my L——'s sake and yours, in answer to your prayers."—Pp. 238, 239.

In January he very nearly lost his life, and was actually reported home as dead, from the effects of charcoal; but he was reserved for a nobler death. The last weeks of his life were spent in a continuance of the same course of duties and religious observances. Their Chaplain was invalided, but he and their officers conducted the Sunday services besides many private ones. The last day of his life was the Day of Humiliation, the 21st. of March, 1855. He had been very anxious that it should be appointed, and himself observed it as a solemn fast:—

'At eleven, and at three o'clock, services were held in Mr. Smith's tent. Hedley Vicars had himself chosen the Psalms and Lessons, which he read, as well as the remainder of the service, with an earnest solemnity which impressed all present. "If it had been the Archbishop of Canterbury," said one, "he could not have done it better."—P. 281.

On that day, he wrote to her who had a right to his most intimate thoughts:—

• "The greater part of another month is past, and here I am still kept by the protecting arm of the Almighty from all harm. I have been in many a danger by night and day since I last wrote to you, my own beloved; but the Lord has delivered me from them all, and not only so, but He has likewise kept me in perfect peace, and made me glad with the light of His countenance. In Jesus I find all I want of happiness or enjoyment, and as week after week, and month after month roll by, I believe He is becoming more and more lovely in my eyes, and precious to my soul."—Pp. 283, 284.

Soon after ten that night, the Russians commenced an attack in the direction of the Victoria Redoubt, opposite the Malakhoff Tower. With a force of 15,000 men, they effected an entrance into the French advanced parallel, who, after a short but desperate struggle, were obliged to fall back on their reserves.

The Russians then marched up the ravine on the right of the British lines, for the purpose of taking them in the rear. They were supposed to be the French on their first approach, till Captain Vicars, with whom this was the first actual engagement with the enemy, discovered them to be Russians:—

'With a coolness of judgment which seems to have called forth admiration from all quarters, he ordered his men to lie down until the Russians came within twenty paces. Then, with his first war-shout, "Now, 97th, on your pins, and charge!" himself foremost in the conflict, he led on his gallant men to victory, charging two thousand with a force of barely two hundred. A bayonet wound in the breast only fired his courage the more; and again his voice rose high, "Men of the 97th, follow me!" as he leaped that parapet he had so well defended, and charged the enemy down the ravine.

'One moment a struggling moonbeam fell upon his flashing sword, as he

waved it through the air, with his last cheer for his men—"This way, 97th!" The next, the strong arm which had been uplifted, hung powerless by his side, and he fell amidst his enemies. But friends followed fast. His men fought their way through the ranks of the Russians, to defend the parting life of the leader they loved. Noble, brave men! to whom all who loved Hedley Vicars owe an unforgettable debt of gratitude and honour.

'In their arms they bore him back, amidst shouts of victory, so dearly bought.

'An officer of the Royal Engineers stopped them on their way, to ask whom they carried. The name brought back to him the days of his boyhood. The early playmate, since unseen, who now lay dying before him, was one whose father's deathbed had been attended and comforted by his own father as minister and friend.'

'Captain Browne found a stretcher, and placing his friend upon it, cooled his feverish lips with a draught of water. That "cup of cold water shall in no wise lose its reward."

'To each inquiry, Hedley Vicars answered cheerfully that he believed his wound was slight. But a main artery had been severed, and the life-blood flowed fast.

'A few paces onward, and he faintly said, "Cover my face; cover my face!"

'What need of covering, under the shadow of that dark night? Was it not a sudden consciousness that he was entering into the presence of the Holy God, before whom the cherubims veiled their faces?

'As the soldiers laid him down at the door of his tent, a welcome from the armies of the sky sounded in his hearing. He had fallen asleep in Jesus, to awake up after His likeness, and be satisfied with it.

'We "asked life of Thee, and Thou gavest it him, even length of days for ever and ever."—Pp. 289—291.

Then follows an appendix, containing some striking and interesting letters from friends, privates and officers, superiors in command, giving expression to their deep feelings of affection and sorrow, with official condolences from Lord Panmure to Lord Rayleigh, Captain Vicars's brother-in-law, expressive of his high sense of his services, and regret for his loss.

¹ The Dean of Lismore.

² Amongst these, we are tempted to extract the following simple effusion of grief and affection, written by his young friend, Douglas Macgregor, to his own mother, the day after. He only survived his friend six months.

'"TO LADY MACGREGOR.

"*Camp before Sebastopol, March 23, 1855.*

"DEAREST MOTHER,—This is a dark and sorrowful day with me; my heart is wrung, my eyes red and hot with crying. I feel gloomy and sorrowful altogether. My very dear friend Vicars was killed last night! The Russians made a sortie; and while gallantly leading on a handful of our men, to charge them outside our works, he was mortally wounded by a ball striking his right breast. He died soon after, and is now enjoying a glorious rest in the presence of his Saviour. I do not pity him. What more could we wish for him? He was fully prepared for the most sudden death, and he died bravely fighting and doing his duty. But my heart bleeds for the loss of my dearest friend, and for the sake of his poor mother and family.

"Such a death became such a life,—and such a soldier. The most gallant, the most cheerful, the happiest, the most universally respected officer, and the most consistent Christian soldier, has been taken from us by that bullet; and I know

It was an heroic end to a truly Christian life. We have been so impressed by the genuineness and power of Captain Vicars's

not how to live without him. He was my truest friend, my most cheerful companion, and my friendly adviser on all occasions. But, as his Sergeant remarked bitterly this morning, 'He was too good to live'

"Oh! how many happy little schemes of mine does this at once put an end to! I had fondly hoped that we should live to go home, and that I might bring my dear departed friend to you, and proudly show him as a specimen of what a model soldier should be. But God's ways are *not* our ways. He spared him from the horrible death of suffocation by charcoal, for a few months, that he might die a soldier's death.

"Noble fellow! he rushed in front of his men; and his powerful arm made more than one Russian fall, before that cruel bullet brought him down. It must have been fired close to him, for his coat was singed. I never knew how much I loved him, until he was so nearly dying of the charcoal. When I heard, at daylight this morning, that Vicars had been brought home dead, you may imagine my excessive grief. I loved that man as dearly as a brother; and it seems that I almost hear his voice sounding in my ears, as he read (two days ago) the Service,—when some of us met on the Day of Humiliation.

"There was a little locket which he always wore round his neck; and I remember, when he heard we were to come here, he said, 'We should all be prepared to give directions what we wished done in case we get killed; for instance, I have got a little Book of Psalms and a locket, which I would wish sent home, in case I die!' Poor fellow! I remembered this; and as I took the locket (a small gold one, which opens like a watch, and has a small picture)—sprinkled with his life-blood—I cried so that I thought I would get ill.

"Oh! his poor mother and sisters, that he loved so dearly. But she is a Christian; and has lived to see her once wild and reckless son come to the fold of Jesus, and prove his sincerity by a long, unswerving, and consistent course. I also cut a lock of his fine curly hair this morning, as I knew his mother would like to get it. If I was to try to write all the good that my beloved friend did, I should not have room. How he fearlessly visited and spoke to the men in the worst times of the cholera: but, as he told me, he got his reward,—for the soldiers' dying lips besought blessings on his head. Oh, how happy he is now! Such a death, and such glory now! Even in death his habitual happy smile did not forsake him. The Lord knew when and how to take him; but it is a severe and unspeakably painful trial to me.

"EVERY ONE liked and respected Vicars; even those who did not agree with his strict religion; and those who had known him so long as the leader of every mad riot, when, after closely watching him for years, and finding that, once enlisted in Christ's army, he never flinched—at last gave in, and acknowledged that Vicars, at any rate, was a true Christian. How sadly we shall miss him in all our little meetings! O God, help me to bear this sad affliction! I can't go on. He died gloriously, and now he is perfectly happy. God help his afflicted family, and help me also to bow submissively to His will!

"Our men got great praise for the fight last night; but who would not go anywhere with such a leader?

"Somehow, I passed a restless, almost sleepless night, and I then heard different arrivals of our wounded men, but did not know that my poor—no, my happy—friend was amongst the number, until parade at daybreak. If you have not lost that crocus which Vicars sent a few weeks ago, please to keep it. Oh! blessed are the dead that die in the Lord!

"Farewell, Vicars, my loved companion! I knew when he went into action he would show that a Christian soldier was a brave, as well as a happy man. I do not exactly know how it all was. I only vouch for the above facts, and the terrible reality of poor Vicars' noble frame lying in the hospital tent, where I saw it. We are in tents here, too. God bless you, dearest mother, and may He sanctify this severe trial to my soul!

"Your
"DOUGLAS."

religion, that we have not cared to dwell as we might have done on points of difference, or to adduce the passages which most show this difference. But, in fact, where differences do not proceed from motives and first principles, but from temperament and external circumstances, they cease to have any vital importance. If a certain strain of religious talking is accompanied by an assumption of superiority—if the most fluent and incessant allusion to sacred doctrines and sacred names is attended by *as* perpetual a reference to self—if the tone implies an habitual hard judgment of others, and consequent want of charity, we are justified in being offended and in mistrusting the system which produces such results;—but if the same fluent strain is free from these deformities, if it flows from an exuberance of spirits which cannot feel without giving expression to what it feels, whether it accords with our taste and judgment or not, we must make the best of it. We must tolerate where we cannot fully sympathise.

Some persons must talk of what is on their minds; keeping all these things in the heart, and pondering over them, is a characteristic of certain minds. We may encourage it on religious subjects as tending to seriousness, reality, and reverence; but if we enforce it on all alike, it becomes a tyranny, and leads to affectation. The heads and leaders of parties are universally prone to stamp their own idiosyncracies upon their systems, and to impose them on their followers. We thus constantly see absurd departures from nature; the pliant temper of the disciple striving against its bent to adopt the style of the master mind which has won his allegiance, to the sacrifice of all independence and vigour. And besides this, reticence in expression may easily be carried too far; it is not natural to suppress the free mention in friendly intercourse and companionship of those deep inner truths which are our greatest comfort and our hope; it is not natural, we mean, to a great many minds, and we plead for some vent to natural feeling. Because minds of intensity, realizing in a peculiar degree the awfulness of the deep things of God, recoil from an unchastened, irreverent, thoughtless treatment of them, must *all*, the young, the simple, the eager, the enthusiastic, be held in a check their own feelings cannot respond to or understand? Such natures will talk: if a system tacitly enforces on them the necessity of being silent on their holiest convictions, and they obey it, they *may* cease to think of them; and while we trust that these impressions are fructifying in the brooding silence of the soul, and that the heart of the neophyte has an inner sanctum to which the soul resorts all the more duly and reverently, because the lips reveal it not, a wholly different result *may* follow. For-

bidden to enlarge on the great and glorious truths of our redemption, except indirectly through symbols and externals, may not those externals become the embodiment of religion—those symbols take the place in the affections of the things symbolized—*solely* because he is permitted to expatiate on these, and to cultivate his taste and exercise his fancy on them, and is expected, contrary to his nature, to observe reserve and self-restraint about the other? We greatly suspect that one of the joys of ‘converts,’ so frequently dwelt on by them, is the immediate enlargement given to their tongues in the new regime, causing, by a merely physical and natural process, a corresponding enlargement of heart. Let every one do as he is moved in his heart, as far as is compatible with the one faith—not judging one another. To us, we must own, it seems a strange impulse in writing to a friend—in *all* our letters to all our friends—to transcribe familiar texts at great length, or many verses of hymns, which must alike be in the memory of writer and reader (which was the habit of this young captain). We can neither comprehend the motive of writing, or the pleasure of reading, these efforts, to the exclusion of all ordinary topics of correspondence. It seems to defeat the use and purpose of letter-writing, which are either to put our friend in possession of our doings or our thoughts, or of the doings or thoughts of others. We should be sorry if this epistolary style were to spread by means of these memoirs, for it *must* result in many cases in affection and assumption; but it is clear that certain sincere, eager minds find this style congenial to them, that it satisfies a craving, that they feel strengthened by the transcription of the words impressed on their own mind, and that the simple reception in return of similar transcriptions fulfils all their ideas of sympathy. And what is said of letters refers also to conversation, of which, of course, we have had specimens in the letters. Where all this is done in truth and honesty, we would wish to do more than acquiesce; we would wish to admire where we cannot sympathise; only entreating such persons not to judge others, who *cannot* go along with them in their habits, practices, observances,—we know not how to designate them. They are utterly contrary to the whole framework of many natures; that spontaneous, easy, fluent manner in divine things, would be as strange to them as armour they had never proved, or costume that they had never worn; and if these ready lips infer from this that they are still of the world, still unconverted, and far away from God (which it is too clear they do), we reply that conversion changes the heart, but it does not change the constitution of the mind; that regeneration subjects it to new sanctifying influences, but not to another construction altogether.

Our appeal throughout has been to nature—to that teaching to which the Apostle referred as of universal and inalienable weight ; meaning by nature, both that human heart with which God has endowed our whole race, that common kindred of sentiment, instinct, and conviction which constitutes humanity, and that particular temperament which makes each man's acts and thoughts his *own* ; which gives the stamp of individuality to all his words and works ; and which makes him a law unto himself.

It is because biographers of the school of Mr. Baillie and Mr. Bonar despise nature, and would prove, if they could, that the highest spirituality annuls and wholly supersedes it, that we take such exception to them ; feeling that no system can infringe the great original law and charter of our being with impunity ; that in proportion to their success harm will follow, for that, next to the inculcation of positive evil, the confusion of the barriers of right and wrong, the confounding things indifferent with things sinful in one wholesale condemnation, is most certain to result in mischief.

ART. VI.—*The Primitive Doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration.*
By J. B. MOZLEY, B.D., Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford.
London: John Murray, Albemarle Street. 1856.

THE volume now before us takes up the conclusions of the treatise on Predestination which Mr. Mozley published about a year ago, and applies them towards the proof of the theory set forth in the present work. The argument of the earlier treatise is to this extent subordinated to that of the latter; and views respecting the effects of Baptism, which are there only hinted at, are here fully unfolded.

The doctrine that all the baptized are regenerate, is exposed to contradiction on two grounds; the one ground wholly untheological, the objection of sight, of supposed personal religious experience, and of what is called common sense, viz. that the baptized, as a body, are manifestly not holy persons—are not ‘regenerate,’ if the word expresses a continued condition of holiness, nor have ever been regenerated or brought into a state of grace, so far as we can see. This, we suppose, is what the mass of people would object, and Mr. Mozley states it thus: ‘the body of persons baptized in infancy are evidently not all good or holy persons,’ or more fully:—

‘For I would put it to any unsophisticated person, who did not come with a bias to the subject, whether it was a natural use of language to call wicked men regenerate, born again, children of God, and members of Christ?—to call them so, not hypothetically, and as a charitable presumption *before* we know they are wicked, but literally, when we know the fact of their wickedness?’—Pp. xxxi. xxxii.

The fallacy of this we shall consider presently.

The other ground is theological, based upon a certain view of Christian doctrine, an extreme theory of predestination, according to which they only who shall finally be saved—the true elect—are at any time really partakers of divine grace sufficient for their salvation. Mr. Mozley (most erroneously, as we trust to show) attributes this form of predestinarianism to S. Augustine; and accordingly argues, that as S. Augustine’s belief was allowedly consistent with Catholic doctrine, the statement that all the baptized are regenerate must necessarily be understood in such sense as to be compatible with this view, which he represents as the teaching of S. Augustine.

These difficulties—this apparent inconsistency of the Church’s doctrine that regeneration is given to all the baptized, with what we experience, or with a particular theological system—have been

felt by many at all times, and have been explained in many ways. Some have lowered the sense of regeneration, and represented it as meaning only a change of relation, an admission to privileges, the external profession of Christianity, or a mere capacity, as Mr. Mozley is fond of expressing it, for holiness. Others have admitted the greatness of the gift of regeneration, but have either severed it from baptism wholly, or represented it as symbolized only, not given by that rite, or as sealed thereby to those to whom it had before been given, or as given to some only of the baptized, whether adults or infants, according to the faith or prayers of themselves, or their sponsors, parents, or the minister of the sacrament. These last have usually explained the language of the Church, which speaks of the gift as universal in the case of believing adults and of infants, as the language of hope or supposition.

Mr. Mozley has seized on this last explanation, but has carried it out with a boldness of imagination and an universality of application which renders his theory absolutely new and original. What others have timidly alleged in excuse for their use of the Church's formularies, and in apologetic explanation of her language, he has manfully set forth as the one account of the Church's language—justified it, if we may so say, on principle, and established it on a breadth of analogy which gives his theory every semblance of truth, except that one of its having any, even the slightest, foundation in fact.

Mr. Mozley states his case (in connexion with the predestinarian view) thus:—

'The position which the Church imposes is, that God gives regenerating grace to the whole body of the baptized; the position which the Church tolerates is, that God gives grace sufficient for salvation to some only of that body. These two positions, inasmuch as the Church contemplates the case of one and the same person holding both, cannot really be in collision with each other; yet apparently they are. Some explanation, then, is evidently needed to reconcile the two, and to show their consistency. I have endeavoured to give this explanation, by considering the predestinarian doctrine last year, that of baptism now.'—Pp. v. vi.

Mr. Mozley's theory of 'sufficient grace' we at present reserve. It is sufficient now to say that the Church's teaching has reconciled the two positions, in that sense of the predestinarian position in which she does tolerate it. Mr. Mozley is not content with any explanation of this same position, except one which is inconsistent with the doctrine of *real* regeneration being given in baptism. He has, therefore, written the treatise before us to show that whereas, as he most fully admits, and earnestly maintains, Holy Scripture, and the Fathers, and the whole Catholic Church, teach that all the baptized are regenerate, they really mean nothing by these words: that they use them only accord-

ing to 'the rule of supposition,' by which persons are said to be that which, in point of fact, they are not.

It ought to be stated at the outset, that when Mr. Mozley, in this work, (or when the Church, whose language herein he adopts,) declares that *all* the baptized are regenerate, the proposition is strictly true only of persons baptized in infancy, and in the case of adults should be limited to those who receive baptism in real and true faith and repentance. So, in a note at the opening of the Preface, Mr. Mozley says:—

'The phrase that "all the baptized are regenerate," is used throughout this treatise as expressing the doctrine of baptismal regeneration. I am aware that it does not express it accurately, because in cases of *adult* baptism, the doctrine even of baptismal regeneration does not allow the individual to be regenerate, unless he has fulfilled the conditions of faith and repentance; and, therefore, inasmuch as all adults may not fulfil these conditions, the doctrine even of baptismal regeneration does not assert that all the baptized are regenerate.'—P. v.

It must also be noticed not once only, that whereas the Church's doctrine is, that every one who receives baptism rightly is *thereby* regenerated, whatever he may afterwards become, Mr. Mozley finds it more convenient to avoid this form of statement, and to speak of 'all the baptized being regenerate,' as if the Church's doctrine was that all persons who have been baptized are at all times afterwards regenerate; that, moreover, he uses the word regenerate as an adjective, not as a participle, and, in accordance with this, he speaks of 'regeneration' as a certain state or condition, not as an event: he regards it as something permanent, as equivalent to 'holiness,' or 'righteousness,' not as something wrought at a definite time; as if we were to discuss what 'manhood' is, instead of what 'birth' is: he treats it as expressing what we are, not what we were once made. The confusion of these two ideas runs through the work, and makes continued reflection and explanation necessary; as may be seen when we say that Mr. Mozley defines regeneration to be *a state* of indefectible holiness. It is quite superfluous to inquire whether this *takes place*, or is given, at baptism. But of this hereafter.

Mr. Mozley then, maintaining that Holy Scripture, as well as the Church, asserts that all the baptized are 'regenerate,' (not, be it observed, have been thereby regenerated,) 'and that 'the literal interpretation of this assertion would be opposed to 'the plainest facts,' infers that another interpretation must be adopted, and that grounded on a principle of language, which he calls the rule of supposition. 'It is common,' Mr. Mozley says (Pref. p. xx.), 'to suppose or presume men to have all 'kinds of good qualities, when they may or may not have them 'in fact. A man in society addresses his next neighbour, whom

‘he never saw before, as if he were an excellent and good man, and assumes the fact in his whole tone and manner. The orator addresses a whole crowd as all honourable men, and national poets speak of whole nations as heroic and magnificent.’ This view is drawn out at length, and the general principle established, in the third chapter of the work, with a fulness of analogy, and richness of thought, and eloquence of language, which we admire, and presume not to praise. It is shown to pervade the conversation, the addresses, the poetry of mankind. In intercourse with others, we suppose all the feelings, the principles, the conduct of good men, and expect, as a matter of course, certain sympathies and judgments from them; still more in bodies of men and societies, of whom, though we well know that many individuals are wholly wanting in such qualities, we yet attribute a character to them, and regard them as noble, brave, honourable, by class or profession. Such would be the feelings among the members of a tribe, in which the great deeds of the few shed light over the whole, from the effect of which each individual seemed to participate in the supposed glory and bravery of his race. We extract some portions of this part of the work:—

‘Strictly speaking, character does not belong to bodies as such, but only to individuals; by a law of the imagination, however, we are able to, and we habitually do, attribute character to bodies; form a certain idea and impression of them, which we carry about with us in our minds, and which makes the body of which we entertain it an object of our affections. A natural tie of common blood or local boundary binds the nation and tribe: an artificial one gives unity to the guild, corporation, university, and such institutions; but both kinds of bodies are susceptible of a character, can excite affections and form a moral object before our minds. We know well enough, as a matter of fact, that the whole of the body is not really what we suppose it to be in the grand or fascinating image of it that we raise in our minds; but yet we suppose it to be what we picture it. We form a high supposition about it; and according to that supposition we think and speak of the whole society as being noble, virtuous, brave, honourable, and the like. And the reason, why this supposition is made with so much greater feeling in the case of bodies than it is in the case of individuals, appears to be this, that in bodies there is, however partial a one, a ground of fact on which the supposition is reared. Every large body of men, whether united by a natural tie or an artificial, contains men of real virtues and high qualities, who make themselves prominent in the history of the society. The character, then, of these individuals is by a law of the imagination extended to the whole body. There is a principle of *imputation* which enters into the supposition about bodies, which does not enter into that about individuals: the few are noble and good in themselves; and the body to which they belong is allowed a participation in their character by a kind of reflection—it is seen in their light, and shines with a vicarious virtue.’—Pp. 62, 63.

And again:—

‘Let us take as an illustration of this mental process with respect to bodies of men, the feeling of the ancient bard with regard to his nation or

tribe. It was the function of the bard to glorify the nation or tribe to which he belonged in verse or song; but, in order to do this, he had himself to form and to produce in his own mind the highest conception of it. And how did he do this? By the process which has been just mentioned. The tribe that, travelling slowly from its northern or eastern birthplace, had traversed half the globe, or that had lived immemorially within the circle of native rocks and mountains, presented to his mind an origin lost in the mystery of remote time. But, as it gradually emerged out of the unknown, it revealed the characteristics of national life in the shape of remarkable men and remarkable events. As his eye ranged over the past, the image of one hero after another rose up before him, who had led his tribe on to conquest, or had headed it against assault, and had signalized himself by heroic courage, ardour, and devotion. Again, event after event rose up before his mind; remarkable occasions and junctures, which had called forth and brought into action the spirit of the whole body, presenting unanimous and inspiring displays of zeal and self-sacrifice, where the people acted as one man, and every one appeared to be a hero. Here, then, was a twofold basis of imputation; he extended the heroism of the great men to the whole body; he extended the heroism of the whole body at particular junctures to the body always. Thus, in proportion to the rapidity with which the men and the events followed each other in his imagination, the average character of his tribe or nation became absorbed in the high specimens of it, its ordinary life in its great events; till, as each succeeding instance confirmed and enforced its predecessor, and the extraordinary manifestations became more and more prominent in his view, to the exclusion of the intervals between them, the whole life of the nation seemed ultimately one heroic energy, and the mind of the bard was raised to the highest pitch of admiration and enthusiasm. His nation became a glorious object,—an impersonation of noble and sublime virtue, which gratified and satisfied the high instincts of his nature. In this state of mind he performed his appropriate function, and communicated his own conception and impression to others. The image he raised lodged itself in every breast, kindling love and enthusiasm; and the nation appeared to every individual member of it a sublime object, to which all devotion was due, and for which the individual ought to live and die. It is true, his moral standard, which was the heroic, was a defective one,—the standard of a rude and uninstructed age, in which the vital flame in human nature wasted itself in action for action sake. But, according to the standard of his day, his nation figured as an impersonation of virtue; which virtue it reflected on all its members. As connected with the body, all the individuals were heroes in his eyes.

‘There is, then, a certain rule of supposition, such as that which has been described; an established and recognised form, which prevails in society, and pervades the intercourse of man with man, which is the foundation of numberless details of behaviour in private and public life, and moulds the whole system of common manners; a form, again, which is applied to bodies of men, to nations, to institutions, and applied with a strong sentiment and feeling. And with this introduction we come to the examination of the language of Scripture respecting that body called the Church, and the individual members of it considered as members of that body.’—Pp. 64, 65.

And Mr. Mozley proceeds to show that this rule has been adopted and sanctioned by Almighty God in speaking of and with His creatures. In the Old Testament, the Israelites are throughout spoken of as a holy nation, a peculiar, a chosen people, as beloved of God, and precious in His sight. Individuals are sinful, the nation is disobedient, still, as a body, they

are designated as holy and righteous; while prophecy, anticipating the brighter radiance which should be shed over the future Church in the Messiah's kingdom, depicts the people as all righteous, and describes an universality of peace and goodness which, it would seem, could only be realized in heaven, or in a millennial heaven on earth:—

But not only is the Jewish people described as the holy people and as collectively the servant of God, and peculiar object of his love, but this very state, which was so much an advance upon that of any other nation in the world, was spoken of as itself only introductory to a still higher and more perfect state, to which the Jewish race was ultimately to rise. The nation at present, though described as "the righteous nation," and God's servant, exhibited much alloy, and its service was but a frail and imperfect one, distorted by a headstrong self-will, and debased by constant defections and sins, especially that of idolatry. They departed largely from their own peculiar law and light, and adopted the morals and the religion of the heathen world. And, accordingly, those very pages of prophecy which represent the nation so strongly as the righteous nation, the people of God, and the object of his love, abound with the sternest rebukes and denunciations of its sins, for which they threaten certain punishment—a threat of which the captivities were the fulfilment. The prophets represent the people as on the one side the object of Divine love, so on the other as the object of Divine wrath; not indeed that these two contradictories attached to the nation in the same sense and equally, but that, just as one who is on the whole a good man and a saint, like David, may commit great sins, and bring on himself severe punishment, so the Jewish nation, which was on the whole God's servant, was still at the same time also a sinner, and the object of Divine vengeance. The Jewish nation was sinful in no other sense than that in which a good man might be: in that sense, however, it was sinful. Up to this point, then, the righteousness of the Jewish people is a mixed, defective, and debased one; and the Jews so far figure in the prophetic books as the holy people in an inferior and imperfect sense. But this state of things was not to last; it was but a preliminary and an early stage in their career, and a brighter day was approaching. The prophet saw in the distance an era, the characteristics of which, if they belonged to any state of things in this world, could only exist in a world much altered and marvellously renovated and improved,—an era when the whole nation would obey consistently and perfectly the law of God, no longer submitting to it as an external yoke, but having it written in their hearts, and following it as their own choice and inclination. This wonderful change was to take place by the influence of a great King who was to rise up amongst them; who, by the force of his character and example, by persuasion, by animating and inspiring exhortations as their Leader and Champion, and, lastly, by a Divine power which belonged to him, would raise in the nation one universal celestial enthusiasm, lodging his image in all breasts and communicating his own virtue to them, kindling in them the love of holiness, and directing the hearts of the people, as the heart of one man, to God as their final rest and object of desire. So great a moral event was to have consequences proportionably great. Such a nation under such a head must convert the whole heathen world to God; for how could such a collective example and the force of such united virtue be resisted? Jerusalem would thus be the head of a converted and renewed world, and all nations would flow into her as their spiritual centre, acknowledging her as their teacher, enlightener, and guide; and repaying the inexpressible benefits received at her hands by humble and grateful deference.

Such, after the preparatory chastisements of captivity and dispersion, would be the ultimate triumph of the holy people, conquering, under their Messiah, all the nations of the earth, not for a selfish and private, but for a spiritual end; ~~giving~~ victoriously over falsehood and vice, overthrowing idolatry, and bringing mankind to the light of virtue and truth. Such a moral renovation of the world again would issue in universal peace and happiness. 'Man would no longer be the enemy of man; strife and confusion would cease, and all hearts meet in communion and love; the curse would be rescinded; paradise would return, never to be forfeited and lost again; and the world would, under the Messiah and righteous Prince, enjoy a glorious and eternal repose.'—Pp. 68—70.

And again:—

'Now it is evident that this whole prophetic account of the Jewish nation, as a righteous nation, the holy people, the servant of God, of its progress and ultimate glory, and triumph, proceeds upon a supposition. The prophet well knew that in matter of fact the whole Jewish nation was not righteous, holy, or God's servant; but that it was an aggregate of individuals, some good men, and others bad, some who were, and others who were not, of the character assigned by him to the whole. He well knew that the whole Jewish nation would not be ultimately triumphant, arrive at a state of final perfection, happiness, and glory, and from this sublime position rule over a renewed and spiritualized world. He knew that only the holy and virtuous portion of the nation could ultimately receive such a reward and such a supremacy; that they alone would be saved, and would be kings and priests for evermore. When he spoke then of the nation as righteous, of the nation as ultimately attaining this triumphant position, he spoke on a supposition. He first assumed the holiness of the nation; then he regarded all the individual members of it as, by virtue of such membership, holy men. The Jew was, as such, a saint in his eyes. He passed over the individual, and only saw the member of a chosen race, one of a divine society, the band of the elect, the Church of the Most High.'—P. 77.

So, in the New Testament, the apostles address those very Christians, whom they yet reprove and warn, many of whom had fallen into grievous sin, and were labouring under great imperfections, as holy and beloved, dead to sin and alive to righteousness, translated into the kingdom of God, sons of God, elect, predestined to eternal life. That is, the qualities which, in a measure, are possessed by some—which ought to be, if God's work were unimpeded, imparted to all, which in His counsels and in their future condition are to be the characteristics of His true people—are attributed to all. All are addressed as ideal Christians, on the rule of supposition. We extract the passage which sums up and justifies the adoption of this rule of language:—

'The language of supposition, indeed, so far from being artificial or insincere, is the natural language of the human heart, the form which true feeling and love instinctively adopt. It is the language which we use to children when we would raise their tender minds to acts of virtue; we exhort them in this form, persuading them by an innocent flattery, that we think, we know them to be good, in order that, with this impression

about themselves, they may do what we bid them as a matter of course, and as if they could not act otherwise. And as it is the earliest, so it is the latest form of exhortation. It is the form used when, with deep convictions, matured powers, and serious aims, the self-respecting mind exhorts itself. The man first thinks and conceives of himself as a virtuous being; one whom a mean action would soil, and an inferior one lower, and then steps to high action upon this impression. A sense of his own moral dignity strengthens him for the moral work, and he advances to the achievement of it on the supposition that he is already of such a character as that particular action indicates and expresses. Thus the ancient bard taught his nation heroism, by supposing it of them, by representing them to themselves as already of that character, and so binding them to support and maintain it. And by the same form of supposition does Scripture teach, addressing itself to mankind in that style which suits alike the child and the man; giving us, like children, the parental pledge that we are good, and telling us, like men, to look on ourselves as such; and so, on the ground that we already are, exhorting us to be, virtuous and holy. Upon this principle proceed the cheering and animating appeals of St. Paul to his Christian converts, when, assuming that they are already dead to the world and risen with Christ, he treats it as impossible that they should sin; will not hear of it, so to say; rejects the very idea as soon as it occurs. This is the mode of exhortation which suits high natures, and all human nature, so far as it is aspiring: and the true teachers of souls know this secret. They know that the power of sin is a depressing thought, a burden on the mind; that they lift it off for the time, they arrange that we start well and unencumbered; they will not say "begin," but "go on as you have begun," because it is cheering to think that the beginning, which is the most difficult part, is over; the impression inspirits us, and gives strength to overcome ensuing difficulties, which become really less, because they seem so; or, rather, they assume the goal already attained, and only say "remain there." Thus a great supposition, a high assumption, is made, and what we have to do is to verify it. In heaven above, within the repository of the Divine mind, and as it were suspended over his head, resides the archetype of every man,—the divine idea in his creation which he was intended ultimately to embody, the designed man. And up to this standard, all who are sincerely bent on fulfilling the will of God and the end of their being are gradually rising, and growing into this sacred, heavenly, and final form. The inspired teacher anticipates this work, and supposes this ultimate state already attained.—Pp. 96, 97.

On this rule of supposition, then, it is (Mr. Mozley says) that Scripture addresses all the baptized as regenerate, and in this sense asserts them to be regenerate.

And as, they profess to follow Scripture, it must be in the same sense that the Fathers and our own Church make the same assertion.

Now, before we proceed further, let our readers observe the advantage Mr. Mozley gains by stating the question in his own words. All the baptized are said to be regenerate, in the same way of supposition as, in every ordinary society, all men are said to be as a body what they ought to be. But the real question at issue is—'Does baptism convey regeneration?' Is each one that is baptized with right dispositions thereby

regenerated? We apprehend that if the point were thus stated, Mr. Mozley's whole fabric of analogies would fall to the ground.

It is well that we should at first state distinctly to what extent it may be allowed that the rule of supposition, supposed to be on the whole a principle in the use of language, can legitimately be applied as a rule of interpretation. First, it may be applied when the state or moral condition of bodies of men is spoken of, because man cannot discern the hearts of individuals; and so it is to be observed that the author, in alleging the language of Holy Scripture, scarcely refers to those texts of Scripture which are usually alleged as connecting baptism and regeneration; but on the contrary, considered as an event, adduces various general addresses containing expressions which, he says, are equivalent to 'regenerate,' (meaning by regenerate a certain state,) as 'sons of God,' 'dead to sin,' 'children of light,' &c.; all which it is said, not that Christians ought to be, but that they are. In such general addresses and designations, there is no doubt whatever that the rule of supposition does apply.

Secondly, it applies to the case of baptism itself, thus far, that whereas to the rightly disposed alone, the believing and the penitent, the graces of baptism are promised, they alone would be admitted to baptism; and so the Church, as before baptizing an adult she ascertains, so far as it is possible, that he possesses the qualities to which the promises of baptism are made, so, after he has been baptized, she supposes that he has received them. Accordingly, the Fathers address the newly baptized as really regenerated, and partakers of the fulness of baptismal grace. Why? Because, if they be what they profess, and what the Church supposed them to be, they are regenerate; just as we should address a body of communicants as having really received what, if rightly minded, they have received.

It is on these principles that, thirdly, the prayers and thanksgivings of the Church are composed, it being *supposed* that those who use them, or for whom they are offered, are true Children of the Church, as in the familiar instance of our Burial Service.

But these are very different applications of the principle from that made by Mr. Mozley, because, *first*, according to his view, no one whatever really receives regeneration in his baptism; it is, in all cases whatsoever, matter of supposition. Regeneration, in his theory, is that indefectible state of holiness which the blessed enjoy in heaven, who cannot sin. And this same holiness is by supposition attributed to all Christians on their admission into the society, without its being really conveyed to any. The

Church *supposes* all adults whom she admits to baptism to be thereby regenerated, because she knows that if they had the dispositions they were supposed to have, they would be regenerated. Mr. Mozley says all the baptized are alike *only supposed* to be regenerate, for that any should truly and actually be regenerate is in the nature of things impossible. We cite his own words, at the beginning of the second chapter, referring to what he had proved in the first:—

‘It appeared that regeneration was a final and a heavenly state, supposed by anticipation to take place in this world when the individual was admitted by baptism into the bosom of the Christian Church, into the communion and fellowship of saints. When once a member of the Christian Church, it was supposed that he had entered a pure and heavenly society, and a high and glorious state, from which he could not afterwards fall away; that he was out of reach of farther danger, and was lodged within the walls of the heavenly Jerusalem.’—P. 42.

Again, there is this fatal objection, that Mr. Mozley’s theory of supposition can only hold of classes of men addressed as possessing certain characteristics, whether privileges or graces, and not of the pledged effects of a given rite; and so it must be observed that, in dealing with the statements of Scripture, he omits to refer to two classes of texts which are most essential in the question before us—those in which grace is *promised* as the effect of baptism, and those in which it is *doctrinally* spoken of as its result. The rule of supposition is a rhetorical figure, and it may rightly be alleged as interpreting the language in which bodies of men are addressed, whether exhorted, or reprovèd, or stimulated by the thought of what they are by profession, or ought to be if they had done their part, or might be if they would yield themselves to their Saviour’s will. But rhetorical figures are out of place in doctrinal statements, such as that baptism saves us, or that we were saved by the washing of regeneration, or that persons are born anew of water and the Holy Ghost. What can such words mean—if we consider by whom they are spoken—but that baptism does actually convey the gifts in question by its own virtue, if men be not wanting to themselves? And in *promises*, figures of rhetoric and the rule of supposition are eminently out of place. It does not save a man from the imputation of falseness to plead the courtesies of society, when he promises a reward on the performance of a certain act, and never gives that reward on the act being performed; it avails nothing to say that he meant nothing by the promise; that he only spoke according to the rule of supposition. When our Lord says, ‘He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved;’ or His Apostle, ‘Repent and be baptized, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost,’ surely we must believe that the promise would be fulfilled; that He would not hold out the hope of

bread, and then only give us a stone, or promise a fish, and give a serpent.

The case, then, of baptism being the instrument of regeneration, whereby they that receive it rightly have the graces which it visibly signs and seals conveyed to them, is quite distinct from the case of all baptized persons, as a body being addressed as regenerate. The latter is rightly explained on the principle of supposition; the former, being the subject of promise and exact statement, cannot be so accounted for.

And this distinction becomes still more evident when we pass from Holy Scripture to the writings of the Fathers; because they are more copious and more varied in their statements than Holy Scripture; and because the progress of time brought out controversies which required more explicit statements to be made respecting the effects of baptism, particularly in relation to the dispositions of the recipients; and these are such as to determine absolutely that persons were held to be regenerated really, not in supposition.

But as Mr. Mozley ignores the promises and the exact statements of the New Testament, dwelling only on its general designations and addresses, so does he avoid all the explicit and determinate statements of the Fathers of the Church.

He would first of all take those passages of Scripture only which speak of Christians as a body: these he would interpret by the rule of supposition, and thereby would conclude the point, that 'all the baptized are regenerate,' was only to be understood hypothetically. As, then, he says the Scriptural language must be explained on the rule of supposition, so must that of the Fathers; thus deciding the point antecedently to any examination of that language. He says:—

'I will make the general remark that the language of the Fathers on this subject is not much more than an expansion or enlarged repetition of that of Scripture. Indeed, to suppose that the Fathers and early writers and teachers of the Church should substantially depart from the language of Scripture, especially on so important a subject, would be a supposition fatal to their authority. But they do not. Their language is such as we should naturally expect would rise upon such a type. The language of Scripture is the root and stock upon which that whole rich, varied, and adorned growth of centuries is formed; and, when the sense of Scripture is ascertained, it becomes at once a key to the language of the Fathers.' —P. 20.

But it may so happen that the language of the Fathers may refuse to submit to the theory of supposition. It may be so explicit, so evidently real, so determined in its meaning by contexts and controversies, that it cannot be understood in any such way. And as Mr. Mozley professes to set forth the *primitive doctrine* of Baptismal Regeneration, the teaching of the primitive

writers is the very point to be ascertained—we are really only concerned with the *fact*; we have only to ascertain what the primitive writers said, and by the ordinary principles of interpretation to determine what they meant.

Now that the Fathers themselves have no notion of their language being to be so interpreted, that they uniformly speak as if what they said was true and real, ought of itself, considering the extent and copiousness of their writings, to be sufficient to determine the question. That cannot well be the primitive doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration which was absolutely unknown and unthought of by the primitive teachers. Mr. Mozley was conscious of this difficulty, and meets it thus:—

‘Will it be objected that the Fathers do not *say*, when they use this language, that they use it hypothetically? such an objection proceeds on a forgetfulness of what the form of supposition is. If we suppose, according to common etiquette, in public or social life, a man, of whom we know nothing, to be good and upright, and address him as such, do we intimate to him at the same time that this is a supposition on our part, and perhaps not a true one? Such an intimation, it is evident, would undo the very form of supposition, and deprive it of all its meaning, as a rule of courtesy. Thus in poetry again: does the bard, when he sings the praises of his nation, and represent them all as heroes, *say* that it is a supposition which he is making? No; he would by doing so neutralise it. He puts his supposition to his own mind as a fact, and will not see, while he makes it, any fact opposed to it. It is, in short, of the very nature of such suppositions as we are speaking of, that they are stated as facts, not *as* suppositions. Accordingly, this language, as employed in prophecy and the New Testament, is in *form* literal; and so it is as employed by the Fathers. Regeneration and the other heavenly and perfect attributes ascribed by them to all baptized persons, are ascribed in the form of literal statement. The supposition, if made at all, could not be made in any other way.’—Pp. 90, 91.

The weakness of all this is patent. The Fathers are not engaged in one continuous act of courtesy, nor are their writings an epic poem. They are like other men in common life, who say what they think, and are compelled, by the cross-examination of controversy, to give evidence as precise as that of a witness at a trial. But Mr. Mozley proceeds:—

‘And if the question be asked, whether the Fathers were themselves always conscious, while they were using this language, that they were using it hypothetically, the answer is, that it is not necessary to the present argument to suppose that they always were. Strong representations, however in the nature of the case hypothetically made, occupy for the time the whole mind of the representer, to the exclusion of opposing facts; and they have only the image which they raise, or the fact of their own creation, before their minds. The human mind is remarkably constituted with respect to the consciousness of its own processes and acts; and is sometimes in one sense conscious of them, in another sense not. Imagine one of the ancient Fathers asserting regeneration, perfection, glory, salvation of the whole baptized body: while he makes the assertion he has only the perfected Church before his mind, not the earthly and mixed one; the Church only as it was designed to be, not as it is. His language is of *such* a Church

literally true, and therefore he may appear to himself at the time to be using such language literally. But ask him, when he has the fact of the mixed or earthly Church distinctly before him, whether he used such language literally of this body, and he would, as a rational man, see that he did not, and that he spoke by supposition and anticipation. And we shall see further on that he himself confesses that he does so.—Pp. 91, 92.

On this last point the issue really turns. We can find no such confession. It will be observed how quietly Mr. Mozley passes from the real question, 'Is the statement that Baptism conveys regeneration one of supposition?' to that of the attributing holiness and goodness to the Church or whole body of Christians. But since modern writers, especially those who write on the history of doctrines, profess to be wiser than the Fathers themselves, and to tell them what they really meant, though they were not conscious of it themselves, it may be necessary to show that the Fathers not only do not say, but that they could not possibly have held, that persons were 'regenerate' only in supposition.

And here one important portion of Mr. Mozley's work is itself the best refutation of his own theory; that portion in which he shows that regeneration, in the view of the ancient Fathers, involved the idea of actual holiness. Mr. Mozley most earnestly argues from the Fathers that regeneration, as they understood it, included not only the power of becoming good, but the actual being good; and to prove this point he alleges their own language, from which, if words mean anything, we must infer that they regarded regeneration as a real change, not a mere supposition. He says:—

* But the sense in which the Fathers understand regeneration is principally seen through the medium of their doctrine of baptism, or their account of the nature and character of the baptismal state; for the Fathers undoubtedly, whether hypothetically or literally, regard baptism as conveying regeneration; and therefore, whatever they assert of the baptismal, they assert of the regenerate state.

'Now, in describing the baptismal state, the Fathers use a whole class of expressions, of a kind obviously inapplicable to the mere capacity for, and applicable only to the actual state of, holiness and goodness. So that, making every allowance for the disposition of writers to exaggeration and over-high colouring, we cannot possibly suppose that they could have used such language of a state which was no better than an indeterminate and neutral one, common to good and bad alike. "We descend into the water," says S. Barnabas, "full of sins and defilement, and come up again bringing forth in our hearts the fruit of a holy fear and hope." "We descend into the water," says Hermas, "consigned to death, and come up assigned to life." Baptism is a "cleansing," a "quickenings," a "reformation," "the attainment of eternal life," says Tertullian. "Come," says Hippolytus, "to the immortality of baptism, come to freedom from slavery, to a kingdom from tyranny, to incorruption from corruption." "Being baptized we are enlightened," says S. Clement of Alexandria, "being enlight-

ened we are adopted sons, being adopted sons we are made perfect, being made perfect we are rendered immortal." "Baptism," says Optatus, "is the life of virtues, the death of crimes, the obtaining of the heavenly kingdom, the port of innocence, and the shipwreck of sins." "It is," says S. Cyril of Jerusalem, "the ransom of captives, the remission of offences, the death of sin, the regeneration of the soul, the garment of light, the holy seal indissoluble, the chariot of heaven, the luxury of Paradise, the attainment of the kingdom, and the gift of adoption." And he thus addresses the baptized person:—"Thou art transplanted among the invisible olive-trees, grafted from the wild to the fruitful, from sins to righteousness, from pollution to purity. . . . Dead in sins thou wentest down, quickened in righteousness thou comest up. . . For, having been baptized unto Christ, and put on Christ, thou hast been made conformable to the Son of God, thou art predestinated to the adoption of a son, thou partakest of the fashion of Christ's glorious body, thou partakest of Christ, thou art properly called Christ; and God said, 'Touch not my Christ, my anointed,' of thee." Baptism, according to Jerome, imparts the new heart and the new spirit spoken of by David and Ezekiel. "The spirit deifies me in baptism," says S. Gregory Nazianzen; "I become the image of God, I am clothed with Christ, I am changed into Christ at baptism." "In the sacrament of baptism," says S. Ambrose, "thou puttest off the old, and puttest on the new-born man. . . Thou art dead to the world and risen to God, dead to sin and raised up to life eternal." "Blessed be God, who alone doeth wonders," says S. Chrysostom, "who made all things, and changeth all. Behold! they enjoy the calm of freedom who a little before were held captives; they are denizens of the Church who were wandering in error, and they have the lot of righteousness who were in the confusion of sin. For they are not only free, but holy; not only holy, but righteous; not righteous only, but sons; not sons only, but heirs; not heirs only, but brethren of Christ; not brethren of Christ only, but co-heirs; not only co-heirs, but members; not members only, but a temple; not a temple only, but instruments of His spirit." "Dost thou," says S. Basil, "invited to ascend to heaven by water and the spirit, as Elias did by fire, not hasten to the call? O wonder! thou art renewed, yet not dissolved; re-cast, yet not broken; cured, yet not pained, and thou thinkest it no gain!"—Pp. 22—24.

Now that it was regeneration, in that sense in which it was the effect of baptism, which was thus a real and actual change, is manifest from their account of baptism and its effects, the allowed difficulty and mysteriousness of it, the arguments and controversies respecting it, and the high esteem in which it was held.

When Origen, for example, speaks of the grounds for the baptism of infants—"that tradition which (he says) the Church had received from the Apostles"—it is 'because there is in all (by birth) the defilement of sin, which must be washed away by water and the Spirit.' (Hom. in Rom. v. Opp. iv. p. 65.) 'If the reason be asked why infants should be baptized, as is the practice of the Church, when baptism is given for the remission of sins, seeing that the *grace of baptism would seem to be superfluous* if there were in infants nothing that needed remission and forgiveness,' &c. (Hom. in Levit. viii. Opp. ii. p. 230)—whereas,

on Mr. Mozley's view, the grace of baptism is always superfluous—or again, 'How can there be any ground for baptizing infants except upon that view, that "No one is clean from defilement, though his life on earth be but for a day?" and because the defilement of birth is put away by the sacrament of baptism, therefore children also are baptized; for "Except one be born again of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven:"' surely this implies a real and actual change wrought by baptism even in infants; and this is but a specimen of a class of passages, many of which are infinitely more decided.

Again, Tertullian (to take but one instance of the kind) commences his tract On Baptism with the question, 'How can so simple a thing as the washing of water produce so great an effect upon the soul?' He regards it, as it was regarded by all, as a difficulty, an inscrutable mystery; and he answers the objection grounded on it by considering the omnipotence of God, not by saying that the alleged effect was in supposition only. It would have been very easy, on Mr. Mozley's theory, if Tertullian had had any inkling of 'the Primitive Doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration,' to have said, 'Oh, the change we speak of, for which we pray before we go down into the water, and give thanks after we have come up from it, is all a supposition; it is a mere symbolizing of what the true elect are ultimately to be. Regeneration, if rightly understood, is a final and heavenly state, supposed by anticipation to take place in this world, when the individual is admitted by baptism into the bosom of the Christian Church.' But Tertullian, knowing nothing of all this, and supposing (as they whom he was answering, and indeed all Christians, it would seem, then did) that the change was real, writes a treatise on the subject which, on Mr. Mozley's view, would be perfectly superfluous. That the effect of baptism is a mystery goes wholly on the view that it is real. So, when the same writer recommended delay in the baptism of children, it was clearly because he believed in its real effects. On the rule of supposition there could be no reason for delay.

Can any one read S. Cyprian's account of the effect of baptism on himself, and not see that it was a real thing, an actual and entire change? And does not Cyprian speak of what he himself experienced as the proper effect of baptism, which would be bestowed on all who received the sacrament with like faith and repentance?

Or how else can we understand S. Cyril of Jerusalem, whose general statements Mr. Mozley cites, in addressing those that are about to be baptized, lays down, in precise terms, that if they come hypocritically they receive nothing, but if they come in sincere faith and penitence, they will all certainly receive

the forgiveness of their sins; still that the degree to which they would receive the influences of the Holy Spirit would depend on their preparation of heart? He says: 'If any has a secret hypocrisy, the Lord rejects that man as unfit for His service: but if He find a man worthy, to him He gives grace readily.' And again, speaking of the sincere: 'Remission of sins is given equally to all: but the communication of the Holy Ghost is bestowed according to each man's faith. If thou hast laboured little, thou shalt receive little: but if thou hast wrought much, ample is the reward.'

Of the unreality and hypothetical character of the gifts, we hear nothing. The subject is treated as a real, practical thing, a matter of common sense, in which the promises of God will really be fulfilled to those who seek Him according to His will, and not to others.

Again, if there had been even the slightest notion of Mr. Mozley's rule of supposition, it must have come out when S. Augustine was discussing the effect of baptism when received insincerely, or administered by heretics. Such baptism is not to be repeated. Why not? Because in those instances the proper effects of baptism were given in the administration of the sacrament, but sealed up, and suspended, as it were, until faith and penitence came to bring forth their full influence. Surely here was an opportunity to bring in the doctrine of supposition, because here was a case in which the effects of baptism were not at the time really enjoyed by the baptized person. But the very exception proves that if there had been the right dispositions, and the sacrament had been administered in the Catholic Church, the graces would have been given not in supposition, but so as really and actually to be enjoyed by the baptized person.

If, indeed, there be any doctrine, the primitive understanding of which has been thoroughly laid open and sifted by controversy, it is that of the effects of baptism, as it was held by the Church in the days of S. Augustine, and expounded by that father himself. And the one father, whose views are important in Mr. Mozley's argument, is S. Augustine. The two great controversies of his life were the Donatist and the Pelagian, and the doctrine of baptism was a cardinal point in each. In the first, the question was as to the effect of baptism when administered out of the pale of the Church; and in this controversy, as we have said, if the gift of regeneration in supposition only had been held by any persons at that time, it must have been brought out, because the very distinction drawn between heretical and Catholic baptism was, that the former gave the graces sealed up, the latter in actual and real possession; and, further, because

the question leads S. Augustine to discuss very fully the case of persons baptized without faith and repentance, who do not receive those graces, which, if they had believed and repented, they would have received; whereas, on Mr. Mozley's view, there is nothing really received by any, but is all an unreality. Let any one read S. Augustine's work, '*De Baptismo*,' and he must see that that Father believed the effects of baptism to be real; and that, if they be only in supposition, the whole controversy is a sham; and had S. Augustine and the Donatist Bishops, when they were assembled in conference, held Mr. Mozley's view, they could scarcely have kept from laughing, any more than the Roman augurs, when they met, at the ridiculous farce they were enacting.

In the Pelagian controversy, the Baptism of infants, as every one knows, was a crucial argument. 'Why are infants baptized for the remission of sins, if they have no sins to be forgiven?' was the unanswerable question of the Catholics; and the hesitation, and difficulties, and tergiversation of the Pelagians, show the straits to which they were reduced. It would have been easy to answer, on Mr. Mozley's theory, that it was all done in the way of supposition. It were easy to allege, as the Pelagians did allege, that it was done in anticipation of future sins, or in an edifying conformity with forms intended for adults, or, almost in Mr. Mozley's own words, that 'the form of baptism was an unreal thing, in which the forgiveness of sins was indeed spoken of and appeared to be conveyed, but was not really given at all,—than which,' says S. Augustine, seeming unable to find words to express his abhorrence of such a notion, '*NOTHING MORE EXECRABLE AND DETESTABLE CAN BE SAID OR THOUGHT.*' We give the passage where he treats of this point in his own words, and we do most seriously recommend to Mr. Mozley's study the sentiments of this great Doctor, whose views he professes to exhibit, and whom he so grossly misrepresents. S. Augustine would not knowingly have admitted a person as sponsor at baptism, who did not believe that the gifts which the Church ritual supposed to be conveyed were actually and really conveyed by it:—

'Suppose' (he says) 'that one of them was to bring a little one to be baptized by me, what effect has my exorcism on the child, if he be not held under the servitude of the devil? At any rate (the Pelagian) himself would have to answer me on behalf of that same child which he bears, because the child cannot answer for itself. How, then, will he say that the child renounces the devil, when he has no part in him? how that he is turned to God, from whom he had never been turned away? that he believes, among the other articles of the faith, the remission of sins, which is not (in his view) given to him at all? For my own part, if I thought that the man held doctrines opposed to these truths, I would not even allow him to come in with the child to the sacraments; but for himself, I know not, *what face he*

would show towards man, what mind towards God, in this action, nor do I wish to say anything more severe. Some of them, indeed, have already seen that *nothing more execrable or detestable can be said or thought, than that when the form of baptism is imparted to infants, it is unreal or fallacious*, in that remission of sins is spoken of and appears to be given, and yet is not at all effected.'¹

Yet this is the writer whose views Mr. Mozley undertakes especially, if not exclusively, to expound, of whom he says:—

'If one father has, in the theological movement of the last twenty years, been quoted and appealed to more than another, it is S. Augustine. Yet I must be pardoned if I say that this constant appeal to his authority has not involved much apparent acquaintance with his system of doctrine. By his system of doctrine I mean that great system of which he was the first expounder in the Church, and which will always be connected with his name. S. Augustine's typical interpretations of Scripture, his devotional writings, and other portions of his works not connected with his characteristic teaching, have been read and quoted; but that great doctrine which constitutes his peculiarity as a teacher and crowned his theological career, which fixed him alike in the chair of mediæval and Protestant theology, and to the inculcation of which the principal energies of his life, as a thinker and writer, were devoted, has hardly been looked into. With the exception of a faint allusion to it here and there, Augustinianism has been left untouched, and persons have been content with the vaguest ideas of what Augustine said or did not say, on what was to him the most important and absorbing question of his whole theological life. With a general impression that he taught predestination, nobody appears to have examined at all the particulars of his doctrine, to have compared his statements, elicited his grounds, or made out his system and *rationale*. This was not, of course, to *know* S. Augustine, for persons cannot be correctly said to know an author if they have not made themselves acquainted with his distinctive and characteristic teaching. But want of acquaintance with S. Augustine was not of itself, perhaps, a matter of so much consequence. What made it of consequence was, that he was often quoted as a witness to a particular doctrine, to which his doctrine of predestination bore an important relation—a relation intimately affecting the mode and sense in which he held the former doctrine;—I refer to the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration. It ought to have been ascertained what his doctrine of predestination was, before he was brought forward so confidently as a witness to a doctrine of baptismal regeneration.'—Pp. ix. x.

What S. Augustine's doctrine of regeneration in relation to predestination was, we shall see presently. That Mr. Mozley utterly misapprehends both the one and the other is quite

¹ Vellem aliquis istorum, qui contraria sapiunt, mihi baptizandum parvulum afferret. Quid in illo agit exorcismus meus, si in familia diaboli non tenetur? Ipse certe mihi fuerat responsurus pro eodem parvulo quem gestaret, quia pro se ille respondere non posset. Quomodo ergo dicturus erat eum renuntiare diabolo, cujus in eo nihil esset? Quomodo converti ad Deum, a quo non esset aversus? credere inter cætera remissionem peccatorum, quæ illi nulla tribueretur? Ego quidem si contra hæc eum sentire existimarem, nec ad Sacramenta cum parvulo intrare permitterem: ipse autem in hoc *qua fronte ad homines, qua mente ad Deum se ferret, ignoro*; nec volo aliquid gravius dicere. *Falsam igitur vel falsam tradi parvulis Baptismatis formam in qua sonaret atque agi videretur, et tamen nulla fieret remissio peccatorum, viderunt aliqui eorum nihil execrabilius ac detestabilius dici posse atque sentiri.*—De Peccatorum Meritis et Remissione, lib. 1. c. 54, § 63.

certain. But the cause also is clear. Mr. Mozley's great abilities have not been subordinated to facts. He has not been content with S. Augustine's own account of his own opinions; he thought the holy Father of Hippo inconsistent, and only half-enlightened. He undertook, in his own words, to '*elicit his grounds*,' and to '*make out his system and rationale*.' It is S. Augustine's doctrine developed, the supposed 'grounds' of his views drawn out, the latent system unfolded, and the *rationale* of it 'made out'; it is logic applied to some only of S. Augustine's principles, carrying these out to their furthest results, and throwing aside all that seemed inconsistent with them. S. Augustine held views on regeneration, and views on predestination; Mr. Mozley would explain away the former, and develop so as to corrupt the latter. He theorises on S. Augustine, and erects a logical edifice, very philosophical, very consistent, but neither primitive nor true.

But though it may be shown most certainly that the primitive Fathers knew nothing of a regeneration by supposition, it is necessary to consider what the grounds are on which Mr. Mozley adopts this theory. They are of two classes. The one, almost entirely independent of predestinarian questions, rests on the nature of regeneration itself, the descriptions of the condition of the regenerate in Holy Scripture and the Fathers, the ideas involved in it as they appear in the writings of the Fathers, in the Services for Baptism, in the doctrines of the Primitive Church about Baptism. All these, in Mr. Mozley's view, represent regeneration to be so high and holy a thing, that it must be literally understood of the state of the blessed in heaven, and can only be associated with baptism in the way of supposition, each baptized person being *supposed* to be endowed with those glorious qualities which are the ultimate and final perfection of a few, the few whose outward calling is realized, and perfected by their final perseverance. This ground, it will be seen, may be taken without reference to the doctrine of predestination.

The second ground is based upon that doctrine. Let it be as Mr. Mozley states it, that sufficient grace is really given only to a few of the baptized; and it follows that when the Church says that all the baptized are regenerate, it can only be in name and in supposition, through their outward admission into the visible Church, whilst in reality they have no part or lot in this matter.

We will examine these grounds. But first, we must state that Mr. Mozley appears to us to treat the whole subject in an unreal way: he alleges the doctrines and expressions of the Fathers; their definitions of regeneration, and grace, and predestination, in a mere eristic, dialectical tone—alleging one

doctrine, or supposed doctrine, and its logical results, for the sake of overthrowing another doctrine, and thus exaggerating the views he puts forth, and stating them much more strongly than has ever been done by those who really believed and advocated them.

For instance, he maintains most strongly, that Holy Scripture and the Church uniformly teach that all the baptized are regenerate, and notices only in a note, on the first page of the preface, and practically neglects, in the process of his argument, the fact that the Church limits the beneficial effects of baptism in adults to those who receive it in faith and repentance.

He exalts to the utmost the greatness of the gift of regeneration, exaggerating the holiness implied in it to a height as yet unheard of, not in order to show how great the gift bestowed in baptism is, but in order to prove that it is so great a gift that it can only be given in the way of supposition; *i. e.* not be given really at all.

He carries out the doctrines of Calvinism to an extent at present practically almost unknown among us, so as to maintain that no grace is given to any one except those who shall finally persevere; that God would not give anything, unless He gave everything; and that salvation nowise depends upon ourselves. And why? Apparently not so much from having any practical belief of all this, as in order to use it as a basis from which to contravene the literal understanding of the proposition that all the baptized are regenerate.

The difficulty of dealing with Mr. Mozley's work is, that the views he maintains are so utterly inconsistent with facts, and apparently so self-contradictory, that one does not know how to argue upon them. It is very much like arguing on the principles of necessity, or about the theories of Bishop Berkeley. We will do it as well and as fairly as we can.

The first ground, then, on which Mr. Mozley adopts the theory of regeneration being given in baptism only in name and supposition is, that the nature of regeneration is such that it cannot be given in any other sense than this.

And in order to show this, he puts forth a view of the nature of regeneration, which we believe to be absolutely new and unheard of among Christian divines. Regeneration, according to Mr. Mozley, is the final, perfect, and indefectible state of holiness, that of the saints in heaven. It is only in a lower and incorrect sense that it is applied to any person on earth; and when so applied, it indicates a state of settled goodness corresponding to this. When connected with baptism, the word is used in its highest sense, but applied only in the way of supposition. Thus we have three uses of the word: (a) all the

baptized are *called* regenerate in the way of supposition, without being really regenerate at all; (b) Christians who have attained to a settled state of holiness are called regenerate really, but in a lower and incorrect sense of the word; (c) the blessed in heaven are alone really and truly regenerate.

It will be seen from this, that Mr. Mozley simply reverses what has been the uniform, as it is also the primitive and Scriptural, use of the word. Regeneration or new birth has hitherto been understood to mean the beginning of the proper Christian life, that is, of the life of grace in the soul,—notwithstanding there may have been some previous influences of the Divine Spirit on the heart preparing and predisposing it for this new birth, (in which view, and relatively to which preparation in adults, regeneration, it is true, is a crowning and final thing.) They in whom the change thus wrought has been carried out to its proper effects, are in a further sense called regenerate; and so, by a derived use, the term expresses the actual condition of those who are living in faith and love—the true children of God. What Mr. Mozley makes the proper sense, is one in which the word is never used at all. There is, indeed, one place in Holy Scripture in which the word ‘regeneration’ is applied to the future state—‘In the regeneration, when the Son of man shall sit on the throne of His glory,’ &c. (St. Matt. xviii.) But in this place the word does not refer so much to the regeneration or new birth of individuals, as to the new birth, as it were, of creation—when there shall be a renewal of all things,—‘a new heaven and a new earth,’—when, in this sense, ‘old things have passed away, and all things have become new.’

The process by which one may come to this view of the nature of regeneration, considered as a state or condition, is by dwelling on the thought of the holiness of the regenerate, considered in its fullest development and most perfect form. If we would arrive at a just idea of the nature of any thing, we consider it in its best state and its highest perfection. If we would ascertain what man’s nature properly is—physical, moral, or intellectual,—we consider it not in its incipient, imperfect, stunted, or distorted specimens, but in its highest and finest condition. So it is if one would ascertain the proper idea of the regenerate nature considered as such—one would contemplate the ripest fruits of the Spirit, and the most finished specimens of holiness. Regeneration, in the sense in which Mr. Mozley uses the word, is the name of the fully perfected condition of those that have been regenerated. But though the word ‘regenerate’ may be used in a sense corresponding to this (as it is popularly used to indicate the character of a good and holy man, he being one in whom his regeneration, or new birth, has

had its perfect work), we believe that the word regeneration must mean an act, not a state or condition. Indeed, in its proper etymological sense, and in the languages in which the Fathers wrote, the word, be it *regeneratio* or *ἀναγέννησις*, could not be so applied. Mr. Mozley's use of the word is wholly his own. It is, of course, evident that to discuss the question, whether in this sense regeneration takes place in baptism; is a mere waste of time.

According to this view, Mr. Mozley's favourite formula is, 'all the baptized are regenerate.' He uniformly avoids the expression, 'all that are baptized, being rightly disposed, are thereby regenerated;' and going upon that formula, he repeats again and again, as an argument absolutely decisive of the question, 'all the baptized are regenerate; but they are evidently not all good and holy persons; therefore they are only called regenerate in the way of supposition.' *

He disposes of that sense of the word in which it has hitherto been unvaryingly used in the Christian Church, in the following passage:—

'Again, I will caution the reader against a particular use which is sometimes made of the term birth, in the phrase "born again," which will lead him in a wrong direction as to the meaning of this phrase. Birth is sometimes regarded in this phrase, as if it were used in tacit distinction to subsequent growth; and the distinction between birth and growth thus assumed is turned into a distinction between the faculty and the state of goodness; the birth; as the beginning, standing for the *faculty*, and the subsequent growth and life, to which it is supposed to be contrasted, for the *state* of goodness. The result of this distinction is, that regeneration or the new birth is regarded as a capacity for holiness, instead of holiness itself. But, first, were this distinction between birth and subsequent growth and maturity intended in the phrase, it would not be the same distinction as that of the faculty and the state, but a very different one. For growth follows inevitably upon birth, the proper circumstances permitting: the plant grows to be a tree, the child to be a man, necessarily; but the state of goodness does not at all necessarily follow upon the faculty. But the distinction is, to begin with, untrue, and is not designed in the phrase. In the phrase "born of God," and "born again," though birth is commencing life, the stress is laid evidently not on the commencement, but on the life; it is a new life which is contrasted with an old one, not one part of the new life which is contrasted with another part. The stress is not upon the birth, but upon the peculiar kind of birth,—that it is a second one, and a Divine one. Nor, indeed, is "born" or "birth" the word always used in this class of expressions; "*son of God*" being used as often, and the term "*son*" being plainly independent of any distinction of this kind.'—Pp. 4, 5.

What Mr. Mozley means by contrasting a 'mere faculty of goodness' with actual goodness will be seen shortly. But we must place the author's views before our readers in his own words. In the first chapter of his work he undertakes to establish these four propositions:—

' I. Regeneration implies in the primitive sense real and actual goodness, in distinction to a capacity for it.

' II. Regeneration implies final goodness, as distinguished from goodness for the time-being.

' III. Regeneration is an imparted as distinguished from an acquired goodness.

' IV. Regeneration is not the less real and actual goodness because it is imparted.'—Pp. 2, 3.

About the last two propositions we need raise no questions. The first we admit with a qualification; the second we quite deny.

It will be observed that, in the first proposition, Mr. Mozley contrasts 'regeneration as implying real and actual goodness,' with 'a capacity for it;' and this contrast pervades his work. At the very opening he sets forth an alternative, which he maintains to be the only possible alternative, in these words:—

' It must be observed, then, to begin with, that the alternative with respect to regeneration lies between two senses, that of actual goodness, and that of a grace enabling to be good. By some regeneration is regarded as a new state of spiritual power or capacity, and no more; and, so understood, it does not include actual goodness and holiness in its meaning at all, but is a state which the most wicked as well as the best of men may be in alike. We see men in common life endowed by nature with greater powers of mind than others, with finer affections, with a quicker sense, with deeper tastes, and with a whole temperament which would have enabled them, had they chosen to direct it to such an end, to have attained a higher goodness than the average of men can attain to, but who, in the absence of such a moral use of their gifts, are by no means better than ordinary men, but very often worse, and sometimes, indeed, the worst of men. In the same way the possession of the highest spiritual powers and capacities is wholly distinct from spirituality in fact, and in forming our idea of the state of regeneration in this sense, we must wholly put the idea of actual goodness aside; for in whatever language we may exalt this state, and however incomprehensible we may assert it to be, and whatever gifts and powers we may include in it, and however mysterious and sublime we may suppose these to be,—it is plain that, so long as we regard regeneration as a state of spiritual capacity simply, or contemplate the gifts and powers contained in it, as depending for their fruit upon a contingent will, regeneration does not imply any actual goodness. The height, or extent, or mysteriousness of the spiritual capacity does not make it differ in the least from the commonest moral one in this respect, that the possession of it is no pledge for the use of it, and is therefore consistent with the greatest actual wickedness in the possessor. Regeneration is in this sense no more than a neutral and indeterminate state common to good and bad alike'—Pp. 1, 2.

On this alternative Mr. Mozley's argument to a great degree depends; for if he can show that Scripture or the Fathers hold regeneration to involve more than this 'mere capacity,' as here described, or to imply any measure of actual goodness, he forthwith infers the other alternative, that it implies settled and final goodness. For example:—

S. Peter speaks of the effects of the new birth, as being "a lively hope, and an inheritance incorruptible and undefiled, and that fadeth not away," thus identifying the new birth with an actual state of goodness and holiness, together with all its hopes and prospects. On the other hand, a mere power of leading a holy life is never called in Scripture a new birth, nor are men ever supposed to be the sons of God because they simply have the capacity for attaining a high and spiritual character. If it were so, it is obvious that our Lord's whole argument with the Jews would fall to the ground. The Jews that persecuted, calumniated, and killed our Lord, would be just as much the sons of God as those who believed in Him and became His disciples. And, in the same way, those that were not led by the Spirit of God would be just as truly the sons of God as those who were; and those who had not faith would as really be the children of God as those who had.—Pp. 6, 7.

The utter fallacy of this alternative we shall trust to show. Suffice it now to say that (as Mr. Mozley states) the schoolmen, some at least of the Reformers, and some (as he himself admits) at the present day, hold that regeneration implies more than a mere capacity for goodness and holiness; that it implies the actual imparting of those graces, in a manner and degree, as we conceive, proportioned to the capacity of the subject, with a tendency as well as a power for their growth and full development; that regeneration involves actual imparted grace, and the gradual development of the fruits of grace, although that grace and goodness be not necessarily either permanent or final. Mr. Mozley's statement, that persons hold that a man living in allowed wickedness is regenerate, is a play on words.

We have said that Mr. Mozley's arguments from Scripture are derived, not from the use of the words 'born again,' &c., when connected with baptism, but from all those expressions which describe the perfect Christian; and they are full of extraordinary and groundless assumptions, such as these:—

'To be a son of God means, in Scripture, not only to be good, but to be necessarily and finally good. That which belongs to sonship in general only metaphorically, belongs legitimately to sonship of God; for God is good by nature; and therefore a son of God, in inheriting the nature, inherits properly and really the goodness of his Father. And this involves a peculiarity in the goodness itself which is inherited; for if God is good by nature, or necessarily, that goodness which a son of God inherits from his Father is a perfect and necessary goodness. Accordingly S. John describes sonship, or being born of God, as involving a perfect and necessary goodness in the creature. Our Lord is, indeed, the only Son of God by nature; and therefore He is the only Son of God who derives naturally from the Father a necessary goodness. The creature, however, is represented in Scripture as receiving, by a wonderful act of Divine condescension and mercy, a sonship of adoption analogous to the natural sonship of the true and only Son; and this sonship of adoption includes a perfect and necessary goodness upon the basis of adoption, as the natural sonship includes it upon the basis of nature.'—P. 7.

And again:—

'To be born of God, then, or to be regenerate, means in Scripture to be perfectly and necessarily good; it is as being "partakers of the Divine

nature" by adoption, to share, by virtue of such adoption, the Divine immutable goodness.—P. 8.

'The goodness of the regenerate man, considered as being born of God, was shown to be a perfect and unchangeable goodness; and his goodness is the same, considered as being born again. For this is implied, in the first place, in the very notion of a new birth, or departure from one life and entrance into another. For death is not only departure from life, but final departure. A man dies once for all, when he dies: a death unto sin, then, is not only a separation from sin, but a final separation; and a final separation from sin is perfection. In the next place, a second or future life differs from the present one not only as being another life, but as being a life of another kind,—as being an eternal and fixed state of existence succeeding a temporary and changeable one. The goodness, therefore, of that second life has the constancy and fixedness of the life. Just as S. John therefore describes the man "born of God" as one who "cannot sin," so S. Paul describes the man "born again" as "dead to sin," "free from sin," and "become the slave of righteousness." That is, he describes him, as S. John does, as unable to sin.—P. 15.

And the conclusion is thus expressed:—

'But the conclusion to which I wish to draw attention *now*, and which I next draw from this form of exhortation, is that it implies not only actual, but final and indefectible goodness, in the Christian. For if the Christian is unable to sin, he is finally and indefectibly good.

'Regeneration, then, is, in the Scriptural sense of the word, final goodness. And as such it is a wholly future or a present state of the Christian according to the sense in which final is understood. If final be understood literally, regeneration does not belong to this life, for the actual final state is future. Regeneration, then, in the correct and literal sense, is a future and a heavenly state of goodness, after trial is passed and all alloy removed. It will only take place when we shall be made the children of God, being the children of the resurrection.'—Pp. 17, 18.

'In another and lower sense, however, regeneration may be regarded as taking place in this life. For the final state of the moral being may be allowed to act retrospectively, and appropriate him from a previous and introductory stage; in which case regeneration belongs to this life, and is a present fruit of the Gospel dispensation. Because the final state has clearly its beginning in this world, the goodness of the perfected creature is the same goodness in substance with that which he had in this life before he was perfected; so long as he is the same being, it is the same goodness in both states, only in the one mature, in the other incipient. But this, though an allowable, is a secondary and incorrect sense of regeneration. For the essential characteristic of the regenerate state is not the substance but the mode of goodness,—the mode of its existence in the soul, which in the regenerate being is constant, eternal and divine, as distinguished from being changeable and interrupted, which it must always be in this world.'—P. 18.

. We have here exhibited Mr. Mozley's view, and given specimens of the arguments by which he supports it, in his own words. It will be seen that, as we have said, he chooses to apply the term regeneration to the full development of the spiritual nature, the ultimate perfection of those gifts of grace the first bestowal of which has hitherto been called regeneration; and that if we wish to know—which is the real question

—whether baptism conveys to the rightly-disposed recipient any spiritual benefit, and what that spiritual benefit is, we must escape from the ambiguities of language by which Mr. Mozley has thrown a mistiness over the whole subject.

When Mr. Mozley proceeds to consider the doctrines of the Fathers, there is a like avoiding of everything definite and exact. He omits all their precise statements of the effects of baptism, and gives us instead their most rhetorical pictures of the blessedness of the baptized. In the work itself, and in the preface, Mr. Mozley selects the very strongest extracts from the ancients that occur in Dr. Pusey's work on Baptism, and then argues from them that regeneration must be in the way of supposition.

He says:—

‘I cannot but express my opinion that had the very work, which most contributed to form the general feeling which brought on the Gorham contest, been read with due accuracy of thought, and a sufficient exertion of reason in the reading of it, this whole contest, with all the trouble and excitement, might have been saved. Dr. Pusey's tract on baptism made a deep and permanent impression by its faithful representation of the baptismal or regenerate state, as described by the Fathers. But so far from the representation of the baptismal or regenerate state, given in this tract, being at all at variance with the Gorham judgment, it appears to me strongly to support and confirm—I might almost say, *anticipate* it.

‘The regenerate or baptismal state is described in this tract in the words of S. Chrysostom, as “righteousness, sanctification, adoption, unnumbered blessings,” “being not only free but holy, not holy only but righteous, not righteous only but sons, not sons only but heirs, not heirs only but brethren of Christ;” as “the putting on of Christ the Son of God, the being transformed into His likeness, the being brought into one kindred and species with Him; being incorporate with Christ, being made flesh of His flesh, and bone of His bone;” as “the same life which Christ had, the life which is above, which appears not, but is in heaven with Christ, health, salvation, renovation, the burden of sin laid aside, the old man with his evil actions thrown off, the new man with his good actions put on;”—in the language of Basil, as “conformation to the likeness of Christ's death, the abandonment of the former course of life, and the commencement of a second; the devil dethroned, God reconciled, salvation and life from the dead;”—in the language of Ambrose, as “dying to earth, and having nothing more to do with it, dying to sin and rising to God, burial with Christ and resurrection to life eternal, the whole outward man perishing, the old man nailed with Christ to His cross;”—in the language of Tertullian, as “a separation of our members from unrighteousness and offence, and joining them to righteousness and holiness; a transference of them from the ways of sin to the gift of life eternal;”—in the language of Hermas, as “the laying aside the deathliness of the former life, being freed from the doom of death and made over to life, discharged from the bond of death and assigned to life;”—in the language of Clement of Alexandria, as “sin washed away, the man no longer evil, the soul enlightened, the character changed;”—in the language of Jerome, as “the robe of royalty, the garment of princes, the putting on of the new man from heaven, the being clothed with mercy for cruelty, with patience for impatience, with righteousness for iniquity, with virtues for vices, with Christ for Anti-Christ;”—in the language of Hilary, as “a return to innocence, to

immortality, to the knowledge of God, to the faith of hope;—in the language of Gregory Nazianzen, as “the health of the soul, the garment of immortality;”—in the language of Gregory Nyssen, as “intimacy with sin abandoned, conformation to Christ’s death, death to sin, such death consisting in not loving the flesh, not desiring riches, not lying, stealing, reviling, but being as a dead man;”—in the language of Cyprian, as “being dead and buried to the carnal sins of the old man, and bearing the image of Him who is in heaven;”—in the language of Origen, as “the spiritual circumcision of the mind, fleshly pollution cut off, the heart cleansed, the soul purified from all defilement;”—in the language of Hippolytus, as “the evil one renounced, the enemy of souls denied, Christ confessed, slavery put off, adoption put on, and a gleaming with the rays of righteousness as with the brightness of the sun;”—in the language of S. Cyril of Alexandria, as “the change from unbelief to belief, from ignorance to knowledge, from the things of the flesh to the life holy and pure, from the things of the world to the love of the things above the world;”—in the language of Gregory Nyssen again, as “being unclothed of the slavish flesh, unclothed of our sins, unclothed of the filthy garment, and clothed with the pure one, unclothed of the beggarly and many-shredded garment, and clothed with the sacred and most beautiful one;”—in the language of Jerome again, as “being clothed with the white, as Christ was with the filthy garment,—with the garment of righteousness as Christ was with the garment of sin;”—in the language of Hilary again, as “the circumcision of Christ, being reborn unto the new man, dying unto the old, being quickened, burial with Christ, and return to eternity, death to sin and birth to immortality;”—in the language of Tertullian, Justin, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Augustine, Cyril of Alexandria, the Gregories, Jerome, Theodoret, as “pardon, the enjoyment of the inheritance, the glory which is on high, the stripping off of the defiled garment of sin, the sprinkling of the conscience, the cleansing and purification of the soul, the destruction of the devil, sin dead, powerless, and drowned like Pharaoh in the Red Sea, countless vices which dwelt in us destroyed, spiritual circumcision, circumcision from error and wickedness, the old man with his carnal life, desires, concupiscence put off, the defilement of our soul melted away, the very approach of sin cut off, the spots of sin effaced, the stain of disobedience cleansed, the cleansing with the invisible hyssop, the righteous mind restored, reformation from evil, spiritual reformation, restoration of original righteousness, the return of the original formation, the stony heart removed for the heart of flesh, a new heart and new spirit imparted, the drinking in of immortality, the overflowing of spiritual graces as of torrents and rivers in the wilderness;”—in the language of the liturgies, as “the blotting out of all stains of sin, purification from the defilement of the old man, nature restored to its first estate, the new infancy of a real innocence, transformation, the putting off of the old man which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts, and putting on of the new man which is renewed after the image of Him that created him, the incorrupt and spotless clothing, the garment of redemption, the robe of glory, the loosing of bonds, the enlightenment of souls, the purification of flesh and spirit, the clothing of immortality, being a clean vessel, a child of light, an heir of the kingdom, being marked unto life, written among the children of grace, being marked with the mark which shall not be effaced, sealed to life everlasting.”—Preface, pp. lv.—lix.

But surely, if Mr. Mozley would clearly set forth what the primitive doctrine of regeneration was, he ought not to have been content with these general, not to say rhetorical state-

ments; but to have considered the most precise, exact, doctrinal statements on the subject that could be found.

He has omitted to consider what Dr. Pusey himself says of the language of the Fathers, viz., that they do not *define*, but *describe* the effects of baptism. They describe them, too, as they are manifested in adults—as they are in their fulness—as what God's work is, or would be, if not hindered by man. The Fathers are not tying themselves down to an exact logical definition of what regeneration is, but, in glowing and eloquent and often highly rhetorical language, setting forth the immensity of the blessings thus given to the worthy recipient; stimulating persons to seek the glorious privileges there held out, dwelling on the great goodness of God, and His willingness to bestow the largest gifts on the most faithful. We have before referred to S. Cyril's words, that, as was the preparation of the candidate for baptism, such would be the spiritual blessing obtained. The more thorough his examination, the more earnest his confession, the deeper his penitence, the larger his faith, the more abundant would be the outpouring of the Spirit upon his soul. 'As is thy faith, so be it done unto thee;' 'Open thy mouth wide and I will fill it.'

Probably the translation of S. Cyril's 'Catechetical Lectures' is in the hands of many of our readers, or can be easily obtained by them. Let any one read the Introductory Lectures, and judge for himself. He will there see an explicit, definite account of the effects of baptism, which are certainly not greater than could be realized on earth.

Let it be remembered that in the passages that have been cited, the Fathers set forth, in their popular treatises, the effects of baptism as wrought by God in an adult coming with earnest preparation, and receiving the fulness of the Divine gifts. They are not defining the nature of the gift necessarily conveyed by baptism to all who did not come to it in hypocrisy. Let it be remembered that to such sincere converts this was the turning-point of their lives; it was looked forward to with fear and anxiety, yet with eager hope; prepared for by special instruction, self-examination, and prayer. It was the act of renouncing the long-cherished service of sin and evil, of embracing a new and holy course of life. It was the means of obtaining all the blessings which Christ had purchased, and which the Gospel offered. In it was promised forgiveness for all the sins that were past. Independently of, and additional to, the special regenerating work of the Spirit wrought in the soul, Baptism combined all that is now associated with the feelings of the Christian, when he lays down his burden at the foot of the cross—all that is felt when a lively perception of the saving work of Christ for us is

brought home to the soul—when an assured hope of forgiveness beams upon us; all that would be felt by a deeply penitent sinner, after he had unburdened his conscience in a sincere and perfect confession, had determinately given up his sins, and heard ‘the absolving words,’ assuring him that his sins were forgiven. It is plain that an exact definition of regeneration in itself—that is, of the very work wrought by the Holy Spirit in the soul of every one in his baptism—would be very different from the glowing pictures of its effects set forth in the popular discourses of the ancient Church. Consider what a wide difference there is between a description of man, and a bare and bald definition of a human being. If we would know how the ancients understood ‘regeneration’ and the effects of baptism when viewed as common to adults and to infants, we must examine their own statements on the subject. Some we have already given from Origen; others we shall give from S. Augustine.

But before we leave this subject of the language of the Fathers about baptism, it is necessary to show how very loose and inaccurate Mr. Mozley is in his account of what they do actually say. We are obliged to limit our remarks. We shall be content, therefore, with taking the first great Father whom he cites, and from whom his extracts are most numerous—Clement of Alexandria. We are quite sure Mr. Mozley does not intend to misrepresent the views of S. Clement; but he has been content with a very superficial study of his writings.

‘S. Clement of Alexandria,’ Mr. Mozley says, ‘uses it’ (regeneration) ‘as *identical with* “a meek disposition,” with “being like a little child,” with “repentance,” with “conversion of life,” with “obedience,” with “faith,” with a “putting off of the garment of wickedness, and a putting on of “immortality.”’¹

¹ ‘Ο πατήρ ἀναγεννήσας πνεύματι εἰς υἰοθεσίαν ἡπίους οἶδεν, καὶ φιλεῖ τούτους μόνους.—*Protagog.* lib. i. c. 5.

“Ἦκετε, ἦκετε, ὦ νεολαία ἡ ἐμὴ” ἦν γὰρ μὴ αὖθις ὡς τὰ παῖδια γενήσῃσθε, καὶ ἀναγεννηθῇτε, &c.—*Ad Gentes*, c. 9. The word ἀναγεννηθῇτε is put as a synonym for στραφήτε, *Matt.* xviii. 3.

Οὕτως οὖν ἐπιστραφέντας ἡμᾶς αὖθις ὡς τὰ παῖδια γενέσθαι βούλεται, τὸν ὄντως πατέρα ἐπινύοντας, δι’ ὕδατος ἀναγεννηθέντας.—*Strom.* i. 3, c. 12.

Δεῖ γὰρ οὐ τὰ εἰδωλα μόνον καταλιπεῖν, ἀ πρῶτον ἐξεθελᾶν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ ἔργα τοῦ προτέρου βίου, τὸν ἐν πνεύματι ἀναγεννόμενον.—*Strom.* i. 2, c. 13. The δὲ here means that the regenerate man *must* act so in consistency, and to verify his name and profession as regenerate.

“Ἀρα εἰκότως οἱ παῖδες τοῦ θεοῦ οἱ τὸν μὲν παλαιὸν ἀποθέμενοι ἄνθρωπον, καὶ τῆς κακίας ἐκδυσάμενοι τὸν χιτῶνα, ἐπενδυσάμενοι δὲ τὴν ἀφθαρσίαν τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἵνα καινὸς γενόμενος καθὼς ἅγιος ἀναγεννηθέντε, ἀμείαντον φυλάξωμεν τὸν ἄνθρωπον. Καὶ σῆπιος μὲν ὡς βρέφος τοῦ θεοῦ, κεκαθαρμένοι πορνείας καὶ πονηρίας, &c.—*Strom.* i. 1, c. 6.

Ἡμᾶς γὰρ εἰσπεποιήτας, καὶ ἡμῶν ἐθελᾶι μόνων κεκληθῆσαι πατὴρ, οὐ τῶν ἀπειθούντων.—*Ad Gentes.* c. 12.’

Such is Mr. Mozley's assertion, but the very contrary is the fact. S. Clement very carefully distinguishes regeneration, or the being born again, from any one of these dispositions. We will examine each of the passages.

Mr. Mozley's first extract is from the 'Pædagogus,' (lib. i. c. 5,) where S. Clement is speaking of the love that parents have for their *little* ones—whose helplessness, and tenderness, and gentle sweetness win their especial love,—'so,' he says (we give the context), 'the Father of all receives those that come to Him for refuge, and having begotten them again by the Spirit unto adoption, so as to be gentle, knows them; and these alone He loves, and helps, and fights for, and such an one He calls 'a little child.' Here the gentle or meek disposition is the result of regeneration.

The next, from 'The Exhortation to the Gentiles,' (chap. ix. § 82,) calls on them to come in these words: 'Come, come, my little ones; for except ye *again* become as little children, and be born again, [as the Scripture says, ye will not receive Him who is indeed a Father (for your Father), nor will you ever enter into the kingdom of heaven.]' Mr. Mozley omits the words we have enclosed in square brackets, and observes:—'The word *ἀναγεννηθῆτε* ("be born again") is put as a synonym for *στροφῆτε* ("be converted"), Matt. xviii.' On the contrary, it is introduced to express an entirely different idea, as the latter part of the sentence shows. S. Clement is bringing together other expressions and ideas besides those of Matt. xviii., and the expression 'the Scripture' alludes, we apprehend, to S. John iii. 6. But, as to *ἀναγεννηθῆτε* being a synonym of *στροφῆτε*, S. Clement shall speak for himself. In the 'Pædagogus' (lib. i. c. 5, § 12), near the beginning of the chapter from which Mr. Mozley's first extract was made, S. Clement cites these very words of our Lord. He says:—'What is meant by the words ("of such is the kingdom of heaven"), the Lord Himself will explain, saying, Except ye be converted, and become as these little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven; *not alluding to* (*ἀλληγορῶν*) *our regeneration* here, but setting before us the simplicity of children for our imitation.' That is to say, S. Clement expressly distinguishes our regeneration from our being converted, and becoming as little children, while Mr. Mozley says he makes them identical.

Mr. Mozley's next extract is from the 'Stromata,' (lib. iii. c. 12, § 88.) 'Thus, then, He wishes us, having been converted,' (or rather, having turned to Him,) 'to become again as little children, having come to know our true Father, having been born again through water.' Here the new birth

is clearly distinguished in idea from conversion; it is that whereby, after we have turned to God, we are born anew as His children.

The next passage (Strom. lib. ii. c. 13, § 58) is as follows:—
 ‘For one that is born again (not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, but) by the Spirit (δὲι), ought to (or ‘must’) forsake not only the idols which he previously regarded as gods, but also the deeds of his former life.’ Mr. Mozley observes:—‘The δὲι’ (which we translate ‘ought’) ‘here means that the regenerate man *must* act so in consistency, and to verify his name and ‘profession as regenerate.’ We do not see any ground for this observation; δὲι seems to mean ‘ought,’ in the sense of ‘it is right,’—what we are bound to do, what is our duty. The context appears to show this. The whole chapter is on men falling into sin after baptism. It begins in these words:—‘He, then, that hath received the forgiveness of his sins ought (χρῆ) ‘not to sin any more;’ and the words immediately preceding the quotation are—‘He, then, that has come to the faith from out of the Gentiles, and out of his former way of life, and has once for all obtained the remission of his sins, and after this has sinned, and then repents, even if he obtain forgiveness, ought to feel shame, as he is not again washed unto the forgiveness of sins. For one that is born again,’ &c. What becomes of Mr. Mozley’s view ‘that the regenerate man *must* act so,’ or of his theories of the Fathers holding the holiness of the regenerate to be in supposition only. S. Clement speaks of realities, of real forgiveness, real renewal, a real falling away, a real return by repentance, a renewed real forgiveness, only without our having the assurance given of it that is conveyed by baptism.

The next passage speaks of the true ‘children of God,’ and describes them as having put off the garment of wickedness, &c. A description of the children of God must not be made identical with a definition of regeneration, though it may readily be admitted as a description of its effects. It is difficult to see why the last passage is introduced. It says that God would be called the Father of Christians only, not of the ‘disobedient’ (τῶν ἀπειθούντων), i.e. of the heathen who refuse to submit to the faith of Christ.

Mr. Mozley has omitted one passage in S. Clement which is more to his purpose than any he has cited. It is in the well-known story of the young man who had lapsed after his baptism, and was restored by S. John, of which restoration S. Clement speaks as ‘giving a great example of true repentance, and a great evidence of regeneration (μέγα γνώρισμα παλλυγείας), and a trophy of the future resurrection.’

But even allowing that the term is here applied to the restoration of the young man, (and not, as it might well be, to the power of his original new birth in baptism, vindicating and exhibiting its hitherto latent force in his repentance,) one instance of this kind is not to be set against the otherwise uniform sense of the word by S. Clement, who uses it to express the effect of baptism.

The rest of the citations from the Fathers are just of the same kind. We return to the question of the nature of regeneration.

Mr. Mozley complains that those who opposed Mr. Gorham never gave any definition of regeneration. A reason for this, not indeed connected with that controversy, but with a much higher and nobler aim, he would have found given in a work often referred to by him—Dr. Pusey's *Treatise on Baptism*. That author says:—

'Before entering upon the consideration of these passages, however, some may wish to know the meaning here attached to the Scripture words "regeneration," or "new birth," and "birth from above." This were easy for practical purposes, by way of description, so as to set before ourselves the greatness of the gift by baptism bestowed on us; but it is not so easy by way of a technical definition. This arises from the very nature of the subject; for we can only accurately define that which we understand, not in its effects only, but its cause. Things divine, even by describing, we are apt to circumscribe; much more, if we attempt strictly to define them: the depth of things divine cannot be contained within the shallowness of human words. The more carefully we express ourselves in the one way, the more escapes us in another.'—*Pusey on Baptism*, p. 19.

It is plain, indeed, how very different must be a definition of regeneration which is to apply equally to the case of adults and unconscious infants, from a description of it in the case of one of formed character, powerful understanding, and deep religious earnestness. Mr. Mozley does not establish his own views by asking questions about the precise effect of regeneration on infants. The Church doctrine is not affected by the difficulty of solving these questions. We cannot trace the workings of the infant's mind, nor yet of the Divine Spirit upon it. But as we believe that there is in that mind from its birth naturally a corruption and a tendency to evil, so do we believe that that corruption must be removed, and a principle of good, a germ of holiness, and actual holiness so far as the nature of the subject allows, implanted instead of it.

Again, as to the state of a baptized person who has fallen away, it is difficult, perhaps impossible, to determine the exact state of one who has thus come under the influence of grace, and has been made the temple of the Holy Ghost, by the

presence of the Spirit, even when the individual who is the subject of that presence is resisting that Spirit, and wholly living in sin. Such an one is indeed separate from God, spiritually dead, dead in sin; yet we cannot believe him to be in the same state—be his condition better or worse than that of one who has never been admitted to Gospel privileges. He is *regeneratus*, one that has been regenerated; though it only leads to a confusion of ideas to say that he is regenerate.

All these topics Mr. Mozley treats in a very rough and rude manner. He selects a definition of regeneration from the work of a recent writer, which seems to represent regeneration only as a power. Then, throughout his work, he treats this notion of a mere power, mere capacity for goodness, as something mean and contemptible, unworthy to be called regeneration. He seems to forget that a power of doing God's will is not natural, but a high gift indeed. He does not consider that the term power, thus used, implies a tendency. And if, as he seems to think, no change deserves to be valued at all in our moral and spiritual condition, unless it be complete, final, indefectible, we would remind him of the state in which Adam was before he fell. Surely one who professes to receive the teaching of S. Augustine, might regard it indeed as a new birth, and a dying to sin and rising again to righteousness, if baptism restores the soul to the condition in which Adam was first created, if, as S. Augustine ever teaches, it reverses in the little infant the evil condition into which he is born, restores him to God's favour and to a state of grace, though not of indefectibility. Surely the angels themselves were not gifted with indefectibility: yet would not that change be worthy the name of regeneration, or, a new birth, which placed us in the spiritual condition of angels? So deeply imbued does Mr. Mozley seem to be with the idea of indefectibility being the only gift worth having, that we read in one place, where he is engaged in showing that the high value which the primitive Church set on the gift of baptism, in comparison of any previous aids from God, proves that it must be a final, crowning grace:—

‘It is evident that we are put, or supposed to be put, into an entirely new state at baptism, and that regeneration is a new life, a new creation. But does a merely higher degree of the same grace fulfil this complete distinction between the two states before and after baptism? What can a man, by any degree whatever of assisting grace after baptism, do which is wholly different from what he has done before it? He believes and repents before he is baptized; if he lives ever so long in the enjoyment of an assisting grace ever so high after baptism, will he end with anything more than that with which he has begun—faith and repentance? *Will he ever be perfect* so long as he has only a grace which depends on his own will for its effect? He cannot be. *His religious course will at best be a mixture throughout*

of success and failure; the result, so long as it depends at all on himself, will be unsatisfactory; from first to last he will have to grieve over shortcomings and sins; and when he comes to die he will have to do simply that which he did when he was baptized, believe and repent. Then there is no new kind of effect which can be produced in him by assisting grace; and therefore, if this is all that baptismal grace or regeneration means, the latter is not a wholly new state, as it professes to be, but substantially the same with the state antecedent to baptism.—P. 45.

We extract this passage, first to show the unreality of Mr. Mozley's view that indefectibility, secured by irresistible grace, is alone worthy of being regarded as the gift of baptism, (for do not these words describe the life even of saints; as shown, for instance, in the Confessions of S. Augustine, or the narrative of his death?) secondly, to remind our readers that, after all, this indefectible grace was not, on our author's theory, given in baptism at all, only said to be so on the rule of supposition. So that the rite of baptism was a mere dramatic act—an exhibiting, in the way of symbolical representation, of the doctrine of Divine grace, to which there is no corresponding reality except in the condition of the elect in heaven. Indeed, the absurdity to which Mr. Mozley's theory reduces him cannot be better shown than by citing his own words about persons falling away after baptism:—

'There cannot, indeed, be any fall, *really and in fact*, from a final state; for such a state is, by supposition, one from which there can be no fall; it is the perfect and eternal state of the soul. But when the baptized person sins, he falls from the supposition which has been made about him that he is in this state, and can never have the same supposition made again about him in this life. He has falsified a great title which was given him, and it can never belong to him on earth again. He has been supposed by S. John to be unable to sin, by S. Paul to be for ever dead to sin; but the event has proved that he is still accessible to the power of sin and alive to its pleasure. His heavenly life, then, has vanished; and he can never regain it below. He has not verified it in act, and therefore the supposition falls to the ground; he returns to the earthly life of alloy, struggle, and difficulty, and no longer has, but waits for, his adoption and regeneration.'—Pp. 48, 49.

We return to the subject of the dilemma, grounded on the alternative which Mr. Mozley proposed between two senses of the word regenerate. Throughout his work, Mr. Mozley argues on the supposition that no third view is possible beside these two,—either that regeneration conveys a mere power without any real goodness whatever, or that it is the gift of final, indefectible holiness.

Yet in page 35, in adducing the authority of the schoolmen to prove that regeneration is more than a mere capacity, he incidentally proves against himself that there is a third alternative:—

'To this proof of the nature of regeneration, as understood by the inspired writers and the Fathers, I will briefly add the sense attached to it in the schools. The schools, as represented by Peter Lombard and Aquinas, certainly do not regard regeneration as a state of mere capacity for holiness and goodness, but as involving that character itself. They understand by it a state of grace; but grace signifies, in the schools, not grace as a means, but as an effect; *i. e.* not merely assisting grace, which depends for its effect on the human will, but grace which is effective, or carries its own designed effect with it. The function of grace is to infuse the theological and moral virtues into the human heart, which thus receives in grace a renewal in fact, and not merely an assistance of which that renewal is the object. Baptism was pronounced, in the schools, to "confer grace and the virtues." "Baptism," says Peter Lombard, "is the abolition of sin, the apposition of virtues." Aquinas lays down the position just mentioned, and carries it out both by explanation and application. The grace and virtues conferred in baptism imply fruitfulness in good works; and children obtain grace and the virtues in baptism. The schools had indeed a remarkable machinery in readiness for reconciling this language with facts; but I am speaking here simply of the sense in which they understood the term regeneration. In their interpretation of that term, they did not venture to depart from the great Scriptural sense of it, which the Fathers had followed and handed down, as goodness *in esse* and not *in posse*. We have nowhere, either in Scripture or antiquity, any authority for understanding regeneration as a state of mere power and capacity for the spiritual life and character—a state involving only assisting grace, means of grace, and the like. One meaning is stamped upon the word in Scripture—and the Church has never used it in any other,—that of real holiness and goodness.'—Pp. 35, 36.

But surely neither of final nor indefectible holiness and goodness, but only of such degrees of them that if the person lived after baptism he might fall away.

Again, in the note at the end of the work, Mr. Mozley at last finds out that almost in our own day a third view is definitely held. He says:—

'I have assumed in this treatise that the alternative in the case of baptismal regeneration lies between an actual goodness which is hypothetically, and a capacity which is literally, possessed by all the baptized. Bishop Bethell, however, in the preface to his work on Baptismal Regeneration notices an opinion, entertained, it would appear, by some even now, that actual virtues and holy dispositions are infused into the minds of infants at baptism, and that this constitutes their regeneration. On this idea, then, as being an attempt to unite both points, *i. e.* actual goodness as the sense of regeneration, with the literal bestowal of such regeneration on all the baptized, *i. e.* all baptized in infancy, I will make one or two remarks.'—P. 137.

The remark he makes is this:—

• 'In the first place, then, I must observe that this idea, if tenable, is wholly at variance with the more common and received doctrine of regeneration as a spiritual capacity simply, imparted in baptism; and that it would alter the whole of that more common and received language with respect to baptismal regeneration, founded on the latter supposition. For according to this idea, regeneration, consisting in actual virtues and holy dispositions, would be coincident with such dispositions among the baptized; the infant would be regenerate so long as he remained such; the

adult so long as he retained the holy dispositions imparted to him in infancy; but one who lost these holy dispositions, and fell into sinful habits, would be no longer regenerate. But the more common and received language, which is founded on the supposition of regeneration being a capacity, speaks of men as wicked and as regenerate at the same time. According to this idea of regeneration as a literal infusion of holy dispositions, however we might speak of all *infants* as regenerate, the growth of vice, carelessness, and irreligion after that age would prevent us from applying the term to the great majority of adults, that is to say, to the great mass of Christian society, to the Church as a body. We could not speak of their regeneration as a present but only a past fact, which would be a complete subversion of the received language to which I have referred, on the subject of baptismal regeneration.'—Pp. 137, 138.

We will not cite Mr. Mozley's further remarks, which object to the possibility of infants having any holy dispositions, asserting that 'reasonableness and intelligence in the agent is essential, and is part of the very meaning of virtue and moral disposition.' It is so in adults. But will one who holds the doctrine of original sin, maintain that the reverse of that corrupt condition of birth is impossible—that it is not as possible for one to be 'sanctified from his mother's womb,' or to be freed from his original guilt, and, if it so pleased God, even from tendencies to evil, as it is to be born in sin, and with such tendencies to sin that nothing but grace—and that, as is alleged, irresistible—can save him from them!'

In the next paragraph Mr. Mozley admits that infants may have the germs of particular dispositions, which he thus explains:—

'By the germ of a character we mean particular latent tendencies in the natural constitution, which afterwards, as the infant grows up into a reasonable, intelligent being, and according as, in this new state of existence, he uses or abuses, cultivates or neglects these tendencies, become formed habits and dispositions. These tendencies, then, so long as they are latent, incipient, and elementary, and exist in the being while he is as yet without intelligence and reason, are not virtues, are not moral habits and dispositions.'—Pp. 138, 139.

Now, it will be seen that much of this is a dispute about words, and about what we cannot discover, viz. the condition of an infant's mind. But we are not, on account of our ignorance of this, to deny the power of Divine grace.

But further, Mr. Mozley goes on to show how both the schoolmen and some of the Reformers, including Luther, maintained 'that baptized infants are in possession of actual virtues and holy dispositions, which are imparted in baptism to them.' We have no space now to go into this question, but we must observe that Mr. Mozley's alternative between regeneration not implying any real goodness at all, and its implying established, nay, indefectible goodness, really omits the view which,

it would seem, has been pretty universally held by Catholics, that regeneration does imply the gift of real and actual goodness, according to the spiritual capacities of the subject, but that this real and actual goodness is neither final nor indefectible.

If any one wishes to know what may be fairly regarded as the Anglican view of the nature of regeneration, he may read Hooker's definition, thus cited and endorsed by Dr. Pusey:—

'The view, then, here held of baptism, following the ancient Church and our own, is, that we be engrafted into Christ, and thereby receive a principle of life, afterwards to be developed and enlarged by the fuller influxes of His grace; so that neither is baptism looked upon as an infusion of grace distinct from the incorporation into Christ, nor is that incorporation conceived of as separate from its attendant blessings.

'The following sentences of Hooker express, in that great master's way, the view here meant to be taken:—"This is the necessity of Sacraments. That saving grace which Christ originally is, or hath for the general good of His whole Church, by Sacraments He severally deriveth into every member thereof. By baptism therefore we receive Christ Jesus, and from Him the saving grace which is proper unto baptism.—Baptism is a Sacrament which God hath instituted in His Church, to the end that they which receive the same might be *incorporated into Christ, and so through His most precious merit obtain as well that saving grace of imputation, which taketh away all former guiltiness, as also that infused divine virtue of the Holy Ghost, which giveth to the powers of the soul the first disposition towards future newness of life.*"—Pusey's *Scriptural Views of Holy Baptism*, p. 24.

But now, since the subject before us is the '*Primitive Doctrine of Regeneration*,' and since the great Doctor whose views Mr. Mozley, as we shall see, would allege, in order to disprove his literal acceptance of the statement, that all the baptized are regenerate, is S. Augustine, that holy Bishop shall speak for himself as to the effects of baptism and the nature of regeneration; and we will only draw our readers' attention to these points:—1. That regeneration, in his view, involves some actual goodness, in the 'doing away of the sins which separate us from God,' and 'the healing the bite of the old serpent,' and 'the destroying the body of sin.' 2. That this actual goodness is by no means final, but is compatible with a concupiscence remaining in the regenerate, against which they have to contend, which they may overcome, or which may overcome them. We leave it to Mr. Mozley to decide whether this is what he so contemptuously calls 'a mere capacity.' 3. That the gift of regeneration and the effects of baptism are real and actual, and that there is not a shadow of the notion of the gift being in supposition. Regeneration is given to all the baptized, if rightly disposed, and it involves a real inward change and a real forgiveness of sin. It is the beginning of the Christian life, the first-fruits of the Spirit.

S. Augustine says :—

‘ In infants, at any rate, the effect of the grace of God, through His baptism who came in the likeness of sinful flesh, is that the body of sin is destroyed. *It is not, however, so destroyed that the concupiscence which has been sprinkled into, and inborn in the very living flesh itself, should be at once annihilated and no longer exist ; but so that, what existed in him when born, should not harm him when dead.*’

To appreciate the greatness of the change involved in these words, S. Augustine’s doctrine of original sin must be kept in mind :—

‘ For’ (he proceeds) ‘ if he live after his baptism, and come to an age capable of obedience, he has there this concupiscence with which to contend, and by the aid of God to overcome it, *if he has not received His grace in vain,—if he would not be a castaway. For not even to adults is this granted in baptism (except haply by an unspeakable miracle of the most omnipotent Creator), that the law of sin, which is in the members, fighting against the law of the mind, should be wholly and entirely extinguished,*’ and *rise to be :* but that whatever of evil hath been done, or said, or thought by a man, when he was serving that same concupiscence with his mind subjected to it, is wholly put away, and reckoned as if it had not been done ; yet that the concupiscence itself continues, the bond of guilt being undone by which the devil held the soul in bondage through this concupiscence, and the obstacles being destroyed, whereby he separated man from his Creator,—yet that it should remain for us to contend against, in that struggle wherein we chastise our bodies and bring them into subjection.’

It is quite clear, then, that, in the belief of S. Augustine, the effect of baptism did not leave man morally and spiritually what he was before. Whereas he had been the slave of sin and guilt, he is now not only set free, and reconciled to his God by assured forgiveness, and stimulated by the power of Divine love and the sense of reconciliation to contend against the remains of his original evil nature, but has an inward power enabling him to contend, which before he had not, and which renders him susceptible of the influences of Divine love. This could only be by the grace of God’s Holy Spirit, whereby the

¹ In parvulis certe gratia Dei, per Baptismum ejus qui venit in similitudine carnis peccati, id agit, ut evacuetur caro peccati. Evacuatur autem, non ut in ipsa vivente carne concupiscentia conspersa et innata repente absumatur, et non sit ; sed ne obsit mortuo, quæ inerat nato. Nam si post Baptismum vixerit, atque ad ætatem capacem præcepti pervenire potuerit, ibi habet cum qua pugnet, eamque adjuvante Deo superet, si non in vacuum gratiam ejus susceperit, si reprobus esse noluerit. Nam nec grandibus hoc præstatur in Baptismo, nisi forte miraculo ineffabili omnipotentissimi Creatoris, ut lex peccati, quæ inest in membris repugnans legi mentis, prorsus penitus exstinguatur, et non sit : sed ut quidquid mali ab homine factum, dictum, cogitatum est, cum eidem concupiscentiæ subjecta mente serviret, totum aboleatur, ac velut factum non fuerit, habeatur ; ipsa vero soluto reatus vinculo, quo per illam diabolus animam retinebat et inclusione destructa, qua hominem suo Creatore separabat, maneat in certamine, quo corpus nostrum castigamus et servituti subicimus (1 Cor. ix. 27), vel ad usus licitos et necessarios relaxanda, vel continentia cohibenda. — De Pecc. Mer. et Remiss. lib. I. c. 39 (§ 70).

love of God is shed abroad in the heart. We do not see how : this doctrine of S. Augustine differs from that of a 'capacity' for holiness, which Mr. Mozley denounces—that of a 'sufficient grace,' which we ourselves believe to be given to all the baptized—that grace which might be ultimately effectual or not, which he will not hear of.

Again, in order to show S. Augustine's views most fully:—

'Who knows not that if a baptized infant come to years of discretion and believe not, nor restrain himself from unlawful lusts, *what he received as a little one will profit him nothing?*' [observe, he does not say the child received nothing.] 'If, however, after receiving baptism he depart out of this life, the guilt by which he was originally bound being removed, he will be perfected in that light of truth, which abiding unchangeably for ever, enlightens the justified by the presence of their Creator. For sins alone separate between man and God, which are removed by the grace of Christ, through whom as our Mediator, we are reconciled when He justifieth the ungodly.'¹

Again, in the second Book of the same treatise:—

'When infants, then, are conformed to the death of Christ by the Sacrament of baptism, we must acknowledge that *they are freed from the bite of the serpent* [that is, the evil wrought by the fall], *if we would not err from the rule of the Christian faith.*'²

And soon after, most explicitly:—

'Those that have been born of sinful flesh, escape from the condemnation which is the due of the old man by the sacrament of spiritual regeneration and renewal. For on account of the questions which have been raised, or yet may be raised on this subject, we ought especially to observe and remember this, that the *remission of all sins is alone effected fully and perfectly in baptism, yet that the quality of the man himself is not wholly changed at once*; but that by a *newness increasing from day to day in those who make good progress, the spiritual first-fruits change into themselves what was old and carnal, till the whole is so renewed* that even the animal infirmity of the body comes to spiritual firmness and incorruption.'³

¹ Cæterum quis ignorat quod baptizatus parvulus, si ad rationales annos veniens non crediderit, nec se ab illicitis concupiscentiis abstinuerit, nihil ei proderit quod parvus accepit? Verumtamen si percepto Baptismate de hac vita emigraverit, soluto reatu cui originaliter erat obnoxius, perficietur in illo lumine veritatis, quod incommutabiliter manens in æternum justificatos præsentia Creatoris illuminat. Peccata enim solæ separant inter homines et Deum, quæ solvuntur Christi gratia, per quem mediatorem reconciliamur, cum justificat impium.—De Pecc. Mer. et Remiss. c. 19 (§ 25).

² Cum itaque per Baptismi sacramentum morti Christi conformentur infantes eos a serpentis morsu fatendum est liberari, si à Christianæ fidei regula nolumus aberrare.—Ibid. lib. ii. c. 27 (§ 43).

³ . . . Filii ex parentum reliqua vetustate toti vetusti, et in peccati carne propagati, damnationem veteri homini debitam Sacramento spiritualis regenerationis et renovationis evadunt. Illud namque præcipue, propter quæstiones quæ de hac re motæ sunt vel moveri adhuc possunt, attendere ac meminisse debemus, tantummodo peccatorum omnium plenam perfectamque remissionem Baptismo fieri: *hominis vero ipsius qualitatem non totam continuo commutari; sed spirituales primitias in bene proficientibus de die in diem novitate crescente commutare in se quod carnaliter vetus est, donec totum ita renovetur, ut animalis etiam infirmitas corporis ad firmitatem spiritualem incorruptionemque perveniat.*—Ibid. (§ 44).

Baptism then was, in S. Augustine's view, the beginning of the Christian course, and the grace then given—that is, regeneration—was the first-fruits; 'a man not being wholly changed at once, but proceeding on from grace to grace from day to day.'

Again:—

'As long, then, as the law remains in the way of concupiscence in the members, the guilt of it is taken away whilst itself remains; but it is taken away (only) for him who has received the sacrament of regeneration, and *has already begun to be renewed*.'¹

And:—

'If he depart this life immediately (after baptism), there will not be any thing whatever to hold him as guilty, all that held him being taken away.'

Mr. Mozley says, the proper meaning of regeneration is that of the final, indefectible holiness of the saints in heaven, and that when used of anything which takes place in this life, is used in a lower and imperfect sense. Now, what says S. Augustine? He cites S. Ambrose, and evidently approves of his words, speaking doubtfully on the point whether the term 'regeneration' can be applied to anything after this life, and explaining and justifying the use of the word from the meaning of that regeneration which takes place at baptism; *i. e.* the regeneration that takes place at baptism is regeneration properly so called—that which is spoken of after this life, is so called in an improper and derived sense.

'Let us see' (says Ambrose) 'whether there be not a regeneration for us after the race of life is run; of which it is said, 'In the regeneration, when the Son of Man shall sit on the throne of His glory.' For as that is called the regeneration of baptism, whereby the foulness of sin is washed away and we are made new; so does this appear to be called a regeneration, whereby we are purified from every stain contracted in the body, and the senses of the soul being cleansed, are born anew unto eternal life.'

Our readers will now be able to judge how far Mr. Mozley's theory can be called the primitive doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, or how far he can be considered a competent

¹ Quamdiu ergo manet lex concupiscentialiter in membris, manente ipsa reatus ejus solvitur; sed ei solvitur, qui sacramentum regenerationis accepit, renovarique jam coepit.—Ibid. lib. ii. c. 28 (§ 45).

² Denique si continuo consequatur ab hac vita emigratio, non erit omnino quod obnoxium hominem teneat, solutis omnibus quæ tenebant.—Ibid. (§ 46).

³ Videamus, inquit, 'ne qua sit post hujus vitæ curriculum nostra regeneratio, de qua scitum est, *In regeneratione, cum sederit filius hominis in throno gloriae suae*. Sicut enim regeneratio lavacri dicitur, per quam deteras peccatorum colluvies renovamur; ita regeneratio dici videtur, per quam ab omni corporeæ concupiscentiæ purificati labe, mundo animæ sensu in vitam regeneramur æternam.—Cont. Julian. Pelag. lib. ii. c. 8, § 22.

exponent of the teaching of S. Augustine, to whom he is diametrically opposed in all the great features of his system;—we will not except even that of regeneration, as implying actual goodness (in whatever sense infants are capable of goodness), because the *regeneratus*—that is, the person who has received regeneration, and has been born again—may, in the view of S. Augustine, become the slave of sin, and finally perish.

But Mr. Mozley cites several passages out of S. Augustine, with the view of showing that that Father held that the baptized were said to be regenerate only in the way of supposition. Here we have again to remind our readers of the fallacy arising from the confusion of 'regenerated,' as expressing a past event, and 'regenerate,' as expressing a present spiritual condition. Mr. Mozley's extract (p. 115) out of a homily of S. Augustine (in Ep. Joan. Tract. V. c. 3, § 6), speaks of one that has been baptized, and is now without love. 'Let him look within, and see if that is accomplished in the heart which is done in the body: Hath he love? If he hath, then let him say, I am born of God. If he hath not, a mark indeed hath been placed upon him; but he is a deserter and a vagabond. Let him not say he is born of God unless he hath love.' That is, no one is truly and effectually regenerate—regeneration has not had its fruits in him—unless he have love. But yet he has been marked as the soldier and servant of Christ.

The important words of the next extract (p. 116, De Bapt. cont. Don. iv. 24, 25) are:—'In baptized infants, the sacrament of regeneration preceded; and, if they hold to Christian piety, conversion of the heart will follow that of which the outward sign preceded.' That is, whereas in the case of adults conversion comes before baptism, in the case of infants, from the necessity of their circumstances, it follows it. But observe

¹ We may notice incidentally that in this place, as in others, (as De Bapt. cont. Don. i. 4, § 5, *Intuentur similitudinem notæ militaris, &c.*) S. Augustine teaches—and much of his argument against the Donatists, on rebaptizing, turns upon this view—that baptism impresses 'a certain mark or character upon the soul;' whereas Mr. Mozley, at p. 115, says that 'the schoolmen introduced this idea of the baptismal character,' though they 'never spoke of it as regeneration, or grace of any kind, from which they carefully distinguished it, though it is difficult to know what they meant by it.' So, at p. 80, he says—'The schoolmen adopted, indeed, another sense of the term "seal." They explained the difficulty that all Christians were spoken of in the New Testament as sealed, while all Christians were not in fact holy, by attaching a neutral sense to the term; and the scholastic "character" stood for a mark simply representing the rite of baptism, and, though indelible, adhering to the saved and to the damned alike. The grace of baptism was indeed wholly separated from this "character," and ascribed to another and a different act of God. But this was a complete departure from the Scriptural meaning of the word.' The schoolmen here simply repeated the doctrine of S. Augustine; a fact of which Mr. Mozley does not seem to be aware.

the words, if they *hold to* Christian piety, 'Si Christianam tenuerint pietatem;' that is, if they *continue* in that grace which was given them in baptism, not if they begin anew.

S. Augustine says in the next extract (p. 117): 'God distinguishes the regenerate from the unregenerate, in mature life,' [it ought to be more exactly translated, *if they be already* adults—*si jam in majoribus ætatibus sint*,] 'by their actions:' and in the next, 'nec regenerati spiritualiter in corpus et membra Christi coadificantur nisi boni'—a sentiment in which, we suppose, all Christians would agree. Mr. Mozley does not seem aware that the three next passages (pp. 117—119), which distinguish 'between inward and outward, between spiritual and bodily, baptism,' and on which he lays much stress, refer exclusively to those who receive outward baptism without faith or repentance, like Simon Magus, who is alleged as an instance; they come to be baptized hypocritically. We cannot suppose that Mr. Mozley would, knowingly, have cited these passages thus, because he is well 'aware,' as he states in the note at the beginning of the preface, 'that the doctrine even of Baptismal Regeneration does not allow the individual to be regenerate, unless he has fulfilled the conditions of faith and repentance.' And yet it seems that the passages on which he bases his position, that S. Augustine held that there could be outward baptism without inward grace, are passages which are quite foreign to the question. Nay, Mr. Mozley alleges S. Augustine as here speaking of 'baptized persons living in sin,' whereas he is speaking of adults baptized without believing and repenting. But we cannot leave unnoticed the fact which Mr. Mozley observes, that in treating of these very persons, who, coming to baptism without faith or repentance, received no inward benefit whatever, S. Augustine doubted whether he should not allow that even these were 'born of the Spirit.' What becomes, then, of Mr. Mozley's allegation of S. Augustine's words, a little, three or four pages, before, that they only who had love were born of God? He now says:—

'In the following passage, it is true, he hesitates at first between two modes of speaking respecting baptized persons who live in sin; between saying that they are born of the Spirit, though not profitably, and not in such a way as to admit them into the kingdom of heaven, and saying that they are *not* born of the Spirit; but he evidently inclines to the latter language.'—P. 118.

And again:—

'The alternative of language, that the wicked are born of the Spirit in baptism, so far as it is allowed, is only allowed in this passage in an ambiguous and inconsistent way, with the qualification that they are not admitted into the kingdom of heaven; a salvo which greatly neutralizes it,

for to be born again and to enter into the kingdom of God are evidently different portions of one whole language representing a particular spiritual state, one of which, therefore, cannot be excluded without impairing the other. But this alternative evidently is made to give way at last to the other more straightforward and consistent mode of speaking, and the writer recurs to his general and established distinction between the outward and the spiritual baptism.—P. 119.

It appears, then, that S. Augustine doubted whether he should or should not call those who were baptized without faith and repentance, and who, as all allow, received no benefit from their baptism, ‘born of the Spirit’ or not. Will Mr. Mozley now reflect on the contemptuous manner in which he has spoken (Preface, p. xli.)¹ of those of the present day who use the term ‘regenerate’ of all the baptized, and also of those only who are actually holy, sometimes in the one sense, sometimes in the other? Will he consider that the cases about which they doubt, whether persons should be called regenerate or not, are those in which the validity and efficacy of the rite of baptism was

¹ ‘I have said that the alternative, in the case of regeneration, lies between two senses, one involving actual holiness, and the other only a capacity for it. Now, if persons clearly embraced the fact of this alternative, they would come to a proper understanding with themselves on this question; they would proceed at once to compare these two interpretations, and would choose the one which had least difficulties. And in that case, I cannot but think that they would find the difficulties on the side of considering regeneration only a capacity insuperable, while those on the side of considering it actual holiness were very small. They would find that in the one case they had a whole array of plain Scriptural characteristics of regeneration to explain away; while, on the other, the only difficulty would be the hypothetical application of the term, which, considering the abundance of precedent for this mode of speaking, would be no great one. But unfortunately they do not clearly embrace the fact of this alternative. They go on with a vague indefinite sense of regeneration as including both of these alternatives at once; each of which they use according as they want it. When the greatness of the baptismal gift is the point, regeneration is actual holiness, *i.e.* is described without qualification in all the strong language, Scriptural and Patristic, of which actual holiness is the natural meaning. When the universal conveyance of it in baptism is the point, then regeneration is a capacity only, it being contrary to facts to suppose it more. They thus go on combining two contradictory meanings of the term; thinking of it as involving actual holiness, and as *not* involving it; as being more than a capacity, and as being *only* a capacity. And such indefinite conceptions as these are very difficult to deal with; the *vis inertiae* of inconsistency is strong; and the hammer of reasoning beats in vain on the rock of ancient confusion. You may talk to a person in this state of mind ever so clearly, without effect. You will say, “a thing cannot be, and not be at the same time.” If regeneration is actual holiness, it cannot be anything *short* of it; if it is more than a capacity, it cannot be only a capacity. He will answer you by pointing to a volume of extracts from the Fathers. You will then repeat the argument, and say,—“Very well, you are quite right; that is all correct language; now, then, what do you think it *means*? Is regeneration, as there described, actual holiness or not actual holiness, more than or only a capacity? Choose one of these meanings, for you cannot choose both.” But the appeal will be still often ineffective. Those elementary reasonings, which are so simple and clear on paper, are often the most difficult to embrace in practice; and the mind of your opponent, after a momentary conception of the truth that contradictory things cannot be true together, will relapse, like a spring, into its old attitude, in which it practically thinks they can be.’—Preface, pp. xl.—xlii.

not rendered nugatory by any fault of the recipient; and then reflect that the Doctor, whose teaching he professes to follow and maintain, doubted whether the terms, 'born of the Spirit,' which is at least as strong as 'regenerate,' should not be applied to those hypocrites whose baptism was only outward, and had never touched the soul at all? Did S. Augustine, then, hold so clearly that 'regeneration' involved inward holiness? or would he not have said that the word could be used in either of these two senses?

But on the strength of these passages Mr. Mozley says:—

'These are specimens of a general use of language in S. Augustine; and they appear to decide his sense of the term regeneration: viz., as being the Scriptural one of actual holiness and sanctity of life. How, then, with this meaning of the term regeneration, does he hold *baptismal* regeneration, or speak of the whole body of the baptized as regenerate? The answer is, that he speaks so hypothetically, and not literally; and that he himself tells us with his own mouth that he *does* speak so.'—Pp. 119, 120.

Before we examine the passages which Mr. Mozley alleges, in which S. Augustine does *not* tell us that he speaks hypothetically, or anything whatever of the kind, we must revert to the main cause of S. Augustine's being so prominent in Mr. Mozley's argument. This cause is his 'predestinarianism.'

Mr. Mozley says:—

'A reader of S. Augustine cannot at first understand how it is that he maintains the latter position, and yet maintains everywhere baptismal regeneration; and that without any sign of a peculiarity in his sense of baptismal regeneration, or difference from antiquity in it; or the least apparent idea on his own part of any difficulty in holding the two together, or need of explanation for it. But here is the solution. The assertion which is to be reconciled with predestinarianism in S. Augustine is not a literal but an hypothetical assertion; and in this combination there is no difficulty.'—P. xlii.

Again:—

'I cannot but observe, too, that had baptismal regeneration been commonly understood in S. Augustine's age in the same literal sense in which it is taken by one religious school now, it appears morally impossible that S. Augustine's doctrine of predestination should have been overlooked by the Church. If their account of baptismal regeneration is true, S. Augustine's doctrine of predestination was in plain and palpable contradiction to a fundamental doctrine of the faith.'—P. xlii.

We are obliged to say, that Mr. Mozley fastens on S. Augustine views connected with grace and predestination which he did not hold, and which are inconsistent with the Church's doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration; which S. Augustine's own views are not. Mr. Mozley has adopted, as the only mode of reconciling these statements, what he must himself allow to be a novel interpretation of the Church's doctrine, 'the rule of supposition;' and so it would seem that while S. Augustine's writings have been the text-book of the theological schools of Europe

for a thousand years and more, it was left to Mr. Mozley to discover the incompatibility of his doctrines of predestination and regeneration, and that they can only be rendered consistent by making his statements about regeneration mere 'suppositions.' Others are accused of sinking S. Augustine's predestinarian doctrines by exaggerating his baptismal doctrines; Mr. Mozley sacrifices S. Augustine's baptismal doctrines to his own theory of predestination.

The fact is, that S. Augustine's doctrine of predestination was a new doctrine; but he intended to hold it, with whatever logical inconsistency, in such sense as to be consistent with all that the Church Catholic taught. His case was parallel to that of persons who would hold the doctrine of necessity in such wise as to be consistent with what we experience. S. Augustine meant to hold the doctrine of predestination in a way running parallel with, but not crossing or contradicting, anything which the Church taught of man's responsibility, or of the efficacy of the sacraments, or of grace. It was like a secret key to or explanation of them. What the Church Catholic held of the doctrine of baptism he held. Nor does the doctrine of predestination in itself at all interfere with that doctrine; for men may be predestined to receive baptism and baptismal grace, and afterwards to fall away and perish finally, just as they may be predestined to receive it, to fall away, and then to recover and be finally saved. The two sets of doctrines may be held, and may co-exist in the mind, like parallel lines, which, produced ever so far, do not meet.

But Mr. Mozley has introduced a doctrine unknown to S. Augustine, about 'sufficient grace,'—and a notion also unknown to S. Augustine, that God does not really give such grace to any except those who shall finally persevere,—and a view of the *rationale* of final perseverance, which is also unknown to S. Augustine. With these notions the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration is certainly incompatible.

The words in which Mr. Mozley expresses the opposition are of frequent occurrence in his volume: if regeneration imply the giving of 'grace sufficient for the attainment of salvation,' it is inconsistent with his doctrine of predestination; because that doctrine, 'representing Divine grace, as in its very nature efficacious, and accomplishing the end for which it is given, 'cannot allow grace for the attainment of this end to have been 'possessed at all, where this end is not attained.'

This doctrine is brought out most fully, but in connexion with other views of the subject, in the treatise on Predestination.

In that work it is maintained (pp. 189, 190) that, according to S. Augustine, grace sufficient for salvation is not given to any

but those who shall finally persevere;¹ and Mr. Mozley proceeds, in the next chapter, to determine what sufficient grace is. He says:—

'The measure of this (irresistible) grace which is required for salvation is the same as the measure, whatever it may be, of goodness and holiness which is required. As this grace is the efficacious cause of goodness, exactly as much is wanted of the cause as is wanted of the effect. And to ask this question is exactly the same as to ask, how much goodness is required for salvation.

'If the question, then, be asked, how much goodness is required for salvation? while it is plain that no definite amount can be fixed upon in answer, a certain indefinite one can be. Disobedience and sin for an indefinite portion of life are not incompatible with it; but a man must *on the whole* have manifested a good character. And if it be asked, further, what constitutes such a manifestation, and what is the test of goodness on the whole? the answer is, the end of life—that which the man is at the close of the state of probation in which he has been placed.

¹ 'In the next place I will guard the reader against a mistake which is not unlikely to arise with respect to this doctrine. For it may be asked whether the assertion of an efficacious or irresistible grace involves more than maintaining that there is such a grace which God chooses to give to certain select and privileged persons, without maintaining that it is the *only* grace by which holiness and salvation can be obtained? Whether it cannot be held that God gives an irresistible grace to some, and also gives a sufficient² grace to the rest? Whether the higher gift to a select number, which ensures holiness, is not compatible with the lower one to the rest, which gives them the power to attain it?

'But, indeed, if we consider the matter, such a question as this will be seen to proceed from a confusion of thought on this subject. For upon what ground does any one hold that there is this irresistible grace, except on the ground that human nature needs it, and cannot do without it? but if human nature cannot do without it, nothing short of it is sufficient. This is the ground on which Augustine raises the doctrine, and on which all who do maintain it do maintain it. Indeed, on what other ground can it be seriously maintained? For whether or not it *might* attach as a superfluity to a nature able to do without it, its existence could not be other than a mere conjecture in such a case. For *asserting* its existence there must be an adequate reason given; and what adequate reason can be pretended, except that which is given, viz. that it is necessary? Were this grace, then, maintained as a superfluity, there might consistently be maintained together with it another grace short of it, and only sufficient; but it is maintained as remedial to a fatal disease, as supplemental to an absolute want. The first dispensation did not provide it because man could do without it; the second provides it because he cannot. If any irresistible grace then is maintained at all, it cannot be maintained as a grace along with the other or merely assisting one, but must be maintained as *the* grace of the Gospel dispensation,—the grace by the operation of which all the goodness and holiness there is in men arises. To endeavour, then, to combine it in one system with the other would be to treat it apart from and in opposition to the very ground on which we suppose it to exist. The doctrine of an absolute predestination cannot combine with any other account of the origin of human goodness; it must either be denied altogether, or applied to the whole. An antecedent moral inability in the whole human mass is the very occasion of that decree, which is made for no other reason than to provide³ a remedy for it. It follows, that while those who are affected by its remedial provisions are endowed with that certainty of attaining to holiness which they impart; those whom the decree does not affect remain in their original inability; and therefore, that, besides those who have an irresistible grace, there are none who have sufficient.⁴—Hist. Pred. pp. 189, 190.

We cite this passage as a remarkable instance of the method of determining a matter of fact, as S. Augustine's view of sufficient grace, on *a priori* grounds.

'The amount of efficacious grace, then, which is required in order to salvation, is that which produces this final state of goodness, *i. e.* the grace of final perseverance.'—*Hist. Pred.* pp. 191, 192.

Mr. Mozley here introduces arguments which have no place in a predestinarian theory; for in that theory what has the 'manifestation of goodness,' what have 'tests of character,' to do with salvation? With what earnestness would S. Augustine have repudiated such an interference with the inscrutable ways of God! According to Mr. Mozley, the grace of final perseverance is that measure of efficacious grace which will secure such an amount of goodness as is sufficient to make a man regarded as fit for salvation. We must say, simply, that all this is Mr. Mozley's own speculation—wholly alien from the doctrine and the entire line of thought which pervades S. Augustine's writings on the subject. This is, indeed, manifest to any observant reader of the extracts given from S. Augustine in pp. 202—207 of the *Treatise on Predestination*.

S. Augustine knows nothing of this 'measure and amount of grace.' He hints not at such a view as this, which speaks as if there was a certain quantity of grace given out, as of oil for the virgins' lamps, which would burn brightly enough and long enough for the Bridegroom's coming. On the contrary, he regards final perseverance as a distinct gift, depending (as Mr. Mozley himself shows, pp. 202 and 209) on the inscrutable exercise of the Divine will in terminating our life, as well as on the amount of grace given to us. We may hold, even on a predestinarian theory, that grace sufficient for salvation is given to those in whom it will not be ultimately effectual. Sufficient grace for salvation by no means implies final perseverance.

The final perseverance of any one depends on two conditions—his being brought into a state fit for heaven, and his life being terminated whilst he is in that state. Now there is nothing in a predestinarian theory, as such, inconsistent with the belief that God gives grace and takes it away. S. Augustine, at all events, most certainly held that grace sufficient for salvation was given to persons who finally fell away. He repeatedly asserts and argues that men finally perish, who, if they had been taken out of this life earlier, would have been saved. S. Augustine does not involve himself in any of the intricate questions, as to a sufficient length of the time being allowed for probation, tests of character, and the like, on which Mr. Mozley dwells; he simply says, this man would have been saved if he had died before he fell. His life has been prolonged—he falls away, and is finally lost. And this he sets forth in many points of view, as being one of the most inscrutable mysteries of the Divine government.

But there is this fundamental error in Mr. Mozley's theory:—that nothing can be regarded as a gift of God unless it be a final gift; that a gift given to be taken away is no gift. This assumes that the gift of grace is an absolute gift, nowise contingent on our use of it. But even on a predestinarian view grace may be given absolutely and irrespectively of our conduct, and absolutely and irrespectively be taken away. But most of those who hold the view that grace is given and taken away, would say that the gift of grace was contingent on our use of it; and even if it were not, we could not in anywise be judges, whether there may not be sufficient reasons for bestowing a gift of grace for a time, and then withdrawing it. The doctrine of predestination must be held, if held at all, as that of necessity must be, so as to be consistent with what we experience, or with the known conduct of God. Now all the general statements of Holy Scripture go to show that God does give grace and afterwards (if we must submit to Mr. Mozley's mode of expression) takes it away. All experience goes the same way. There are those of whom there could be no doubt, humanly speaking, that they were influenced by Divine grace; of whom equally there can be no doubt, humanly speaking, that they die in their sins. Scripture and experience alike teach us that the righteous man may turn from his righteousness, and commit iniquity, and in his iniquity may die. Each alike teaches us to pray that God would not take His Holy Spirit from us. These facts, then, may be held by predestinarians, as they were held by S. Augustine. How they are consistent with predestinarianism it is not for us to show; it may be sufficient to suggest that that doctrine, like the doctrine of philosophical necessity, if speculatively true, is practically false. Surely God gave gifts to the angels in their first estate; it is plain that when they fell, these gifts were withdrawn. Adam had gifts, but he also lost them.

The gift of real, nay, sufficient grace, then, cannot be shown to imply final perseverance, from any view that God's gifts must be final; that the bestowing a gift which afterwards is withdrawn, is incompatible with His attributes.

In fact, the gift of final perseverance is quite distinct from the gift of sufficient grace. S. Augustine clearly distinguished them, and thereby was able to hold all the Christian doctrine of baptismal grace, and all that Holy Scriptures and our own experience show to us of the defectibility of grace, consistently with his theories of predestination. Mr. Mozley refuses to admit the distinction—he habitually confounds the two; nay, he studiously endeavours to prove their necessary connexion, and thereby involves himself in the denial of baptismal grace.

He argues the point in the following passage:—

'It may be said, again, that the predestinarian need not believe in the indefectibility of grace, but may hold that grace may be given for a time, and then withdrawn; that, consequently, he may believe baptism to be always accompanied *at the time* by grace, and that this is all that is required for a belief in baptismal regeneration. But baptismal regeneration, as above defined, is a *sufficient* grace always accompanying baptism; and such a temporary grace as is here spoken of is not always sufficient grace. Grace may be temporary, or may be given for a time and then withdrawn, for two reasons—either because the person himself has neglected it, when it would have been sufficient for his salvation, had he availed himself of it; or because it was never the design of the Donor to continue it beyond a certain time. If it is temporary for the *former* of these two reasons, it is undoubtedly sufficient grace; but it is a grace which no predestinarian can allow to be universally given in baptism. If it is temporary for the *latter* reason, the predestinarian can allow *such* a grace universally to accompany baptism (*i. e.* such a grace, *at least*, where more is not given); but such a grace is not sufficient grace. The reconciler of baptismal regeneration with the doctrine of absolute predestination confounds temporariness with one of these reasons with temporariness for the other. He first presents to himself a grace which need be no more than temporary, because it may be withdrawn for neglect, and identifies this grace with that of baptismal regeneration. He then substitutes for this grace a grace which is temporary, because it was always the design of the Donor to withdraw it, and continues the same identification, forgetting the substitution.'—Pp. 108, 109.

Now we conceive that the confusion is produced by our author himself: by his mixing up his own theory of predestination with S. Augustine's doctrine of grace. The question as to the nature or amount of the grace given in baptism is quite independent of the question of final perseverance. The grace is not the less real or the less efficacious while it is possessed, because it will only be possessed for a time. The notion that the grace given in baptism, is that grace which is to last on till it results in final perseverance, is a view of Mr. Mozley, not of S. Augustine. In considering the sufficiency of the grace given at Baptism, we have nothing whatever to do with the question of final perseverance, as will appear from the many extracts we shall make from his works.

Final perseverance depends not only on the amount of grace bestowed, but on the shortening of life. Many a Christian may have grace in such wise sufficient, as that he may live many years in faith and piety; and if it pleased God to cut him off in that state, he would be saved. In the inscrutable justice and holiness of His providence and counsels, He continues the period of probation, and the unhappy being falls away.

Indeed, S. Augustine throughout speaks of perseverance as a distinct gift. He nowhere propounds the view which Mr. Mozley seems to hold, that grace is of a certain strength to carry one on, from the first bestowal of it to ultimate perseverance; that it is one gift, one propulsion, so to say, of the

soul, which has momentum enough to carry it on to the end. He who perseveres, according to S. Augustine, perseveres because God bestows on him this special gift. God wills he should live a longer or a shorter time; but, anyhow, that when he dies he should die in a state of grace.

And as regards the doctrine of sufficient grace, suppose the matter was stated thus, that grace may be given such as that men shall believe, shall live religiously, shall love God, be holy, be such as that if they died they would be saved—who yet, through their life being lengthened, do fall away; can it be denied that grace sufficient for salvation was given to them? They had grace such as to bring them into the condition of children of God, in that sense in which all that are led by the Spirit of God are sons of God. They had grace such as to bring them into a state of acceptance with God, and of actual holiness such as to fit them for admission into heaven.

But here, again, Mr. Mozley, in the passage just cited (p. 244), introduces a theory which is wholly his own, and gives a further definition of sufficient grace. It is, he says, that amount of grace which will ensure such a degree of goodness and holiness, and such a perseverance in it as will bring man to the close ‘*of the state of probation* in which he has been placed.’ But this is introducing a view which does not appear in S. Augustine’s theology. S. Augustine does not argue that the duration of life is determined by the close of our state of probation. On the contrary, he considers that the time when our life ends is one of those inscrutable things which are hidden with God. He speaks of God’s cutting off or prolonging our life as being determined by His own absolute will. He looks to the facts, and does not theorize upon them. The notion that our life ends when our sufficient probation ends, belongs to a free will theory, and has no place in a predestinarian argument. But Mr. Mozley joins this on to Augustinianism, and the result is, that the Augustinian view is quite distorted. He says:—

‘Final perseverance, then, is, upon the Augustinian doctrine, the true and absolute gift of God to certain members of the human race; to whom, according to an eternal decree, He has determined to give it: and it has that prominent place which it has in the predestinarian scheme, because it is that measure of Divine grace which is sufficient for salvation. The predestinarian doctrine is that certain persons are predestined by God from all eternity to be saved; but God only saves the righteous, and not the wicked. It must therefore be provided, in accordance with this doctrine, that those persons shall exhibit as much goodness of life as is necessary for the end to which they are ordained; and final perseverance is this measure of goodness. The gift of final perseverance, then, is the great gift which puts into execution God’s eternal decree with respect to the whole body of the elect. He may predestine some to a higher and others to a lower place, but He predestines all the elect to a place in the kingdom of

heaven; and therefore, while He provides that some shall exhibit, higher and other lower degrees of sanctity and goodness, He provides that all shall exhibit enough for admission; which sufficiency is final perseverance.'—*Doct. Pred.* p. 208.

It is true that the doctrine of final perseverance being a test, is 'no predestinarian one, but only one of ordinary religion and morality.'—(P. 200.) But on that very account it ought not to be joined on to predestinarian doctrines; it cannot be so joined to them without producing inconsistencies. Ordinary religion and morality may make it probable that God would not terminate the life of any one, till he had had a sufficient period of probation; though on all such subjects we must speak very cautiously. But what has a rigid predestinarian to do with a period of probation, when his theory really excludes the idea of probation altogether? If you introduce the view of probation, you cannot object to the view that grace is given to men, by which they might be saved if they would; and that it is withdrawn because they resist it. But if it be maintained that 'besides those who have an irresistible grace, there are none who have sufficient,' then the whole theory of probation must be put aside.

S. Augustine does not involve himself in any theories of this kind. He maintains a predestination in such sense as to be consistent with known facts, and with the received doctrines of the Catholic faith.

Now, one of the things which the Church held as a part of the Catholic faith, which the Pelagians did not venture to deny, was the efficacy of baptism; and the Church held, that by it was conveyed regeneration, the forgiveness of all sin original and actual, the reversing the effects of the fall, except only a root of sin—that is, a tendency to evil—left in the Christian for him to contend against, but which he had the power to overcome; and this was S. Augustine's doctrine respecting baptism.

Again, it was a matter of experience, so far as experience can determine such cases, that men lived religiously, truly believed, loved, and feared God—were in such a state that they would be saved if they died in it, and yet fell away. Now, S. Augustine does not say, as Calvin does, that all this faith and piety is an unreal thing, a falsity, and a deceit, like a base coin, which seems only and is not. He admits its reality; he speaks of it as the fruit of grace—as, indeed, he must have held that if real, it is the work of God's Holy Spirit. He admits the difficulty resulting from it: How can God allow such to perish? and he answers it by saying, that in all these respects the persons in question are truly children of God, but that in the secret depths of the Divine counsels they are not of the

number of those chosen ones who are the children called according to His purpose. On this point Mr. Mozley not only generally misstates S. Augustine's views, but does so with the very passages that assert the contrary cited in his book, only in one case mistranslating his words, and giving them the very opposite meaning to what S. Augustine intended.

Mr. Mozley says (Doct. Pred. p. 413)—'I see no substantial difference between the Augustinian, and Thomist, and 'the Calvinist doctrine of predestination.' This may be true as regards the doctrine of predestination in itself; but it is not true as regards the doctrines held together with it. In this respect the two doctrines differ entirely.

I. S. Augustine held that all the baptized were regenerate; that baptism had a real efficacy in the case of all infants and of all adults who came to it in sincerity. Calvin held that the elect only were regenerate; and that to the rest baptism was only a form, or only related to the visible and external name and privileges of Christians.

II. Consistently with this, S. Augustine held that grace was given and was effectual, to such an extent that if the person had died in that state of grace, he would have been saved. Calvin held what Mr. Mozley holds, that 'besides those who 'have an irresistible grace, there are none who have sufficient 'grace.

And Calvinism is the result of Augustinianism only through that error which is the cause of all heretical aberrations, the taking up one position and carrying it out to its (supposed) logical consequences, irrespectively of any other truths, or their logical consequences, which ought to be held together with it,—we do not say consistently with it; for the reducing the two to a consistency may be quite beyond our power.

But we will let S. Augustine speak for himself; and we wish our readers to see that he holds that persons may have real grace, holiness, piety, and faith, may be such as if they died they would be saved, and yet may fall away, die in their sins, and perish eternally; that he holds that the cause why God cuts short the life of one and protracts that of another is wholly inscrutable; that it can only be paralleled by the inscrutable exercise of His Will, by which, of two twins, one dies before baptism and loses a place in the kingdom of heaven, another lives, is baptized, dies, and is saved. Here we take the extracts as Mr. Mozley translates them (Doct. Pred. pp. 206, 207):—

'If any one asks me why God does not give perseverance to those who by His grace lead a Christian life, and have love, I reply that I do not know,' &c.¹
 . . . 'Of two children, why one is taken and another left; of two adults, why

¹ De Corr. et Grat. c. viii.

one is so called that he follows the caller, and the other either not called at all, or not so called, belongs to the inscrutable judgments of God. *Of two pious men, why final perseverance is given to one and not to the other, belongs to His still more inscrutable judgments.*" . . . The *grace of beginning* and the *grace of persevering to the end*, is not given according to our merits.² . . .

Let us here observe, once for all, that if the one of these men be not really pious, if his seeming goodness be not real, (and it cannot be real if it be not the fruit of grace,) if according to the horrible view of the Calvinist, it be but a splendid sin; then there is nothing at all inscrutable in God's not giving perseverance, which indeed would only be a perseverance in hypocrisy.

Again:—

'Wonderful indeed, very wonderful, that to some of His own sons, whom He hath regenerated, and to whom He hath given faith, hope, and charity, God does not give perseverance.³ I am speaking of those who have not the gift of perseverance, who have turned from good to evil,'⁴ &c.

We think it is plain from these passages, that, as has been generally held by theologians of all schools, S. Augustine taught that it was God's grace, which produced the fruit of faith and piety in those who would not finally persevere. If so, there is nothing inconsistent whatever in his holding that all the baptized are regenerated, on the view that regeneration implies actual holiness, and that some only of them persevere.

The fact also, that S. Augustine held that these were real graces, and yet temporary, shows us the true meaning of the following places, which Mr. Mozley quotes in the work now before us, pp. 120, &c., to show that S. Augustine, 'with his own mouth, tells us that he speaks in the way of supposition, and not literally,' when he says that all the baptized are regenerate. 'His explanation,' Mr. Mozley says, 'is, that those who are called by this name are not always really what they are called, the regenerate, when wicked men, being regenerate only by supposition and presumption.' He begins by citing the last extract but one of those we have given above. He states S. Augustine's difficulty and explanation thus:—

"Wonderful that is that some should be regenerate and yet not be ultimately good men." This is his difficulty: now for his explanation. "We call them," he says, "elect, disciples of Christ, and children of God, because those whom we see to have been regenerated and to live piously are to be called so. But if they have not perseverance, and do not abide in that in which they have begun, they are not truly called so: *they are only called, and are not really, children of God*, inasmuch as they are not so in His eyes who knows what they will be, and knows they will turn from good to evil.'"⁵—P. 120.

¹ De Dono Persever. c. ix.

² De Corr. et Grat. c. viii.

³ Ibid. c. xiii.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ *'Appellamus ergo nos et electos, et Christi discipulos, et Dei filios, quia si appellandi sunt, quos regeneratos pie vivere cernimus; sed tunc vere sunt quod*

‘*Now this is not* S. Augustine’s explanation of the difficulty; his explanation of the difficulty, if explanation it can be called, is the answer of analogy, the adducing the parallel difficulty of the taking away the children of holy and believing men without baptism, and allowing those of unbelieving, unholy men to be baptized. It is all, he says, one great mystery:—‘We are speaking of those who have not the gift of perseverance, but, when their good will falls away from good to evil, die. Let them answer, if they can, why God did not take them out of the perils of this life at the time when they were living faithfully and piously, so that wickedness might not change their understanding, nor feigning deceive their souls?’ The whole difficulty then, and the whole answer to it, go on the supposition that their faith and piety are real and genuine.

What Mr. Mozley alleges as the answer to that difficulty, is the answer to another, which he cites himself in the next page (p. 191, note 2), which is more subtle, because of the twofold sense of the words, ‘sons of God.’

“Let not the fact that God withholds perseverance from His sons surprise us. God forbid, indeed, that this should be true of those who are predestinated and called according to His purpose; *i. e.* of the true sons of promise. But others who will hereafter live and die in sin, though for the time that they live piously they are *called* the children of God, are not considered the children of God by the foreknowledge of God.”—P. 121.

They are the sons of God who are now walking after the Spirit; they are the sons of God who are His secret and hidden elect. And S. Augustine’s answer is not that they seemed to be His sons when they were not by the semblance of righteousness; but that while they were His sons by present adoption and present obedience, they were not such by His secret election. He says this again and again, in the chapter of which Mr. Mozley has extracted, and, we think, misinterpreted, a few lines. ‘*They whilst they live religiously are called the sons of God,*’ (observe they do live religiously, really so,) but inasmuch as ‘they will live irreligiously, and will die in that irreligiosity,’ he does not call them sons of God *in the foreknowledge of God*. . . ‘Some who are called the sons of God by us *on account of grace*

appellantur, si manserint in eo propter quod sic appellantur. Si autem perseverantiam non habent, id est in eo quod coeperunt esse non manent, non vere appellantur quod appellantur et non sunt: apud eum enim hæc non sunt, cui notum est quod futuri sunt, id est, ex bonis malis.—De Corrept. et Grat. c. 9.’ “Regenerate” is used here partly as a technical synonyme for *baptized*. Such is our author’s quiet method of explaining away S. Augustine.

‘De his enim disserimus, qui perseverantiam bonitatis non habent, sed ex bono in malum deficiente bona voluntate moriuntur. Respondeant, si possunt, cur illos Deus, cum fideliter et pie viverent, non tunc de vitæ hujus periculis rapuit ne malitia mutaret intellectum eorum, et ne fictio deciperet animas eorum.—De Corr. et Grat., c. viii. § 19.

'received though but for a time (vel temporaliter), are yet not so to God.'¹ So it seems S. Augustine's explanation was not the hypothetical character of grace, but that which Mr. Mozley denounces so vehemently, its being given only temporally. Again, their righteousness is real, not pretended, and still less a supposition. 'They were not sons, even when they were in the profession and name of sons, not because they simulated righteousness, but because they did not continue in it.'² Again, 'They were not in the number of sons, even when they were in the faith of sons.'³ Of a piece with all this is the passage cited by Mr. Mozley, which says, 'We call them elect, disciples of Christ, and children of God, because they have been regenerated and live piously,' though they are not of so *apud Eum*, that is, are not of the secret elect, the sons according to God's foreknowledge. It is not the reality of their present regeneration or grace which is denied, but their belonging to the number of the chosen; as the saintly doctor goes on to speak of some that '*love God, and do not continue in that love to the end.*'⁴

This is confirmed by the next passage cited by Mr. Mozley:—

'Have not both been called, and both followed the call, and both been justified, and both renewed by the laver of regeneration? They have; but if one who had foreknowledge heard this said of both, he would answer and say, 'This is all true according to our temporary standard, but, according to another, one of these two never was with us; for, if he had been with us, he would have remained with us. There was even before a distinction between them. What distinction? The books of God are open, and let us not avert our eye. Holy Scripture cries aloud, and let us hear it. They were not of us, because they were not called according to His purpose; were not chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world; not predestinated according to the purpose of Him who worketh all things.'⁵—P. 121.

¹ Isti cum pie vivunt dicuntur filii Dei (really so), sed quoniam victuri sunt impie et in eadem impietate morituri, non eos dicit filios Dei *præscientia Dei* . . . Quidam, qui filii Dei propter *susceptam vel temporaliter gratium* dicuntur a nobis, nec sunt tamen Deo.—Ibid.

² Non erant filii, etiam quando erant in professione et nomine filiorum: *non quia justitiam simulaverunt*; sed quia in ea non permanserunt.—Ibid.

³ Non erant in numero filiorum, et quando erant in fide filiorum.—Ibid.

⁴ Propter hoc Apostolus cum dixisset, 'Scimus quoniam diligentibus Deum omnia co-operari in bonum'; sciens *nonnullos* diligere Deum, et in eo bono in finem non permanere, mox addidit, 'his qui secundum propositum vocati sunt.'—Ibid. § 23.

⁵ 'Nonne postremo utrique vocati fuerunt, et vocantem secuti, utrique ex impiis justificati, et per lavacrum regenerationis utrique renovati? Sed si hæc audiret ille, qui sciebat proculdubio quod dicebat, respondere posset et dicere: *Vera sunt hæc, secundum hæc omnia ex nobis erant; veruntamen secundum aliam quandam discretionem non erant ex nobis*; nam si fuissent ex nobis, mansissent utique nobiscum. Quæ est tandem ista discretio? Patent libri Dei; non avertamus aspectum: clamat Scriptura divina; adhibeamus auditum. Non erant ex eis qui non erant secundum propositum vocati; non erant in Christo electi ante constitutionem mundi, non erant in eo sortem consecuti, non erant prædestinati secundum propositum ejus qui universa operatur.—De Dono Perseverantiæ, c. 9.'

Here we are obliged to correct Mr. Mozley's translating, which is generally free, but in this place is incorrect, making S. Augustine say exactly what he does not say. S. Augustine does not deny the *reality* of their calling, following the call, being justified, regenerated, and renewed; he admits it; he represents one admitted to see the secret things of God, saying, 'These things are true; *in all these respects* (*secundum hæc omnia*) they were of us; but according to another distinction, that of being elect in Christ before the foundation of the world, they were not of us;' that is, in their calling, obeying the call, being justified, regenerate, renewed, they were of us; not as Mr. Mozley renders the words *secundum hæc omnia*, according to our temporary standard,' but really. In all these respects the elect and non-elect, who live religiously, are alike. There is no denial of the reality of the gifts to the one any more than the other; but the one is of the secret elect and the other not.

The same is the explanation of the passage cited p. 122; where the question turns on the twofold sense of the word 'elect,' a title given to Christians, '*so long as they believe, are baptized, and live well.*' S. Augustine does not deny the reality of their faith and good living. He admits it. He knew that grace was given temporarily, notwithstanding Mr. Mozley's Calvinistic difficulties, or his denying the possibility of there being any sufficient grace which does not result in final perseverance.

Again, 'regenerated parents, *if at least they persevere in the same grace*, without doubt will not be hurt by (the root of original) sin, on account of the remission of sin, which has been wrought in them, except when they use it (the remaining root of bitterness¹) ill.

Again, of those that are not predestined to life, 'they either lie under original sin which is never remitted by regeneration,' (i.e. they die without baptism) 'or they receive the grace of God, but are only for a time (*temporales sunt*) and do not persevere; they forsake God and are forsaken by Him.'²

And this temporary grace was also in S. Augustine's view sufficient for salvation. By 'grace sufficient for salvation,' we understand such a measure of grace as shall suffice to bring a person to such faith and holiness that if he died in that state he would be saved. For the grace, if we may be so allowed to speak, has done its work when it has done this; that holiness is

¹ Ideo regeneratis parentibus, si tamen in eadem gratia perseveraverint, procul dubio ista, propter remissionem peccatorum, quæ in eis facta est non nocebit, nisi cum ea male utantur, &c.—De Pecc. Orig. x. 38.

² Aut enim jacent sub peccato, quod originaliter generatione traxerunt, . . . quod non est regeneratione dimissum . . . aut gratiam Dei suscipiunt, sed temporales sunt, nec perseverant; deserunt et deseruntur.—De Corr. et Grat. c. xiii. 24.

sufficient for salvation, which would ensure the salvation of a man if he died in that state. Theories of the adequate manifestation of character are wholly foreign to S. Augustine's mind.

We shall cite some passages as they occur in the work, 'De Dono Perseverantiæ;' and first we extract two passages by the way, as indicating S. Augustine's way of viewing the subject, in contrast to Mr. Mozley's:—'If any one has lived (say ten years) 'from the time he became a believer, and in the middle of that 'time has lapsed from the faith, did he not persevere five years?'¹ This is the question on the meaning of the word 'perseverance.' 'No,' says S. Augustine, 'I mean final perseverance, 'and he 'rather has this who has been a believer for one year, or as much 'less as you may imagine, if he has lived faithfully till his death, 'than a believer for many years, if a short time before his death 'he fell from the steadfastness of faith.' This is not like the theory of sufficient manifestation of character. Again:² 'We 'call a man chaste whom we know to be chaste, whether he is' or 'is not to continue in that chastity; and *whatever other Divine 'gift there be that is capable of being possessed and lost,* we say 'that a man has it as long as he has it;' but perseverance none can have unless he has it to the end; this indicates that the gifts of grace may be lost. The other passages express the view which runs through the work, and which is introduced by S. Augustine to show that perseverance is really a gift of God; the duration of life as well as the bestowal of grace, being irrespective of any merits of man, being determined by His own unsearchable will. He is speaking of those 'pious men' 'who 'have been called, have obeyed the call, have been justified, 'regenerated by baptism, and renewed;' to whom, in the passage cited above, p. 252, it is not given to persevere, he says, 'God, knowing beforehand that they would fall, could have 'taken them out of this life, before that fall took place.'³ It is clearly understood that in that case they would have been saved. Therefore they had had grace sufficient for salvation. Again, more explicitly: 'We see, that by His secret yet just judgment,

¹ Si ex quo fidelis quisque factus est, vixit, verbi gratia, decem annos, et eorum medio tempore a fide lapsus est, nonne quinque annos perseveravit? . . . potius hanc habuit unius anni fidelis et quantum infra cogitari potest, si donec moreretur fideliter vixit, quam multorum annorum, si exiguum tempus ante mortem a fidei stabilitate deficit.—De Dono Pers. c. i. (1).

² Dicimus quippe castum quem novimus castum, sive sit sive non sit in eadem castitate mansurus; et si quid aliud divini muneris habeat, quod teneri et amitti potest, &c.—Ibid. c. viii. (10).

³ Certe poterat illos Deus præsciens esse! apuros, antequam id fieret, auferre de hac vita.—Ibid. c. x. (22).

⁴ Videmus ejus occulto, justo tamen judicio quoniam non est iniquitas apud Deum quosdam etiam post Baptismum pessime vivendo perituros, in hac tamen vita quo usque perant detineri; *qui non perirent, si eis corporis mors, lapsum eorum præveniens, subveniret.*—Ibid. (23).

'for there is no unrighteousness with God, some even who will be lost by living wickedly after baptism, are yet kept in this life until they are lost, who would not have been lost, if the death of the body, anticipating their fall, had come to aid them.' Again: 'Of the regenerate themselves, we see some persevering to the end and so departing from life, others kept in this life till they fall away, who certainly would not have fallen away, if they had departed hence before they lapsed; and again, others who have lapsed, not departing out of this life until they return (to God), who certainly would have perished, if they departed out of life before they returned. Hence it is most clear that the grace of God, both for beginning and for persevering to the end, is not given according to our merits, but is given according to His own most secret, and yet most just, and wise, and beneficent will.' It is clear that this argument would be worthless if the regeneration, and faith, and piety, and good life of these persons had been in supposition only, or pretended, or not the effect of Divine grace.

We are sorry thus to part with Mr. Mozley; but we cannot but express our judgment of his work as a treatise on theology. His theory is bold, striking, effectual for reconciling the Church's statement with the judgment of men of the world, or with the theological system of Calvin, but it is utterly without foundation in fact. There is no semblance of evidence for it in primitive antiquity, or in the writers of later times. It represents the whole of the Church's teaching about grace as well as baptism to be a mirage, utterly and absolutely unreal; and obliges us to believe that the teachers and professors of Christianity from the first have been unconsciously supposing that to be real which is fictitious, and the whole faith of the Church to be one complex dream. Happily the theory is so contradictory to fact, that it will itself vanish as a dream, or as the morning mist, which, bright and beautiful as it may look, will only for a moment obscure our view of the everlasting hills, soon rolling away, and leaving them standing, as of old, majestic and immoveable.

Mr. Mozley has done many services to Christian literature. In such fields we trust again to welcome him; and we only regret that he has wasted his great powers on inventing a theory, which is neither theologically nor historically defensible.

¹ *Ipsos regeneratos, alios perseverantes usque in finem hinc ire, alios quousque decedant hic teneri, qui utique non decidissent, si antequam laborerent hinc exissent; et rursus quosdam lapsos quousque redeant non exire de hac vita, qui utique perirent, si antequam redirent, exirent. Unde satis dilucido ostenditur et inchoandi, et usque in finem perseverandi gratiam Dei non secundum merita nostra dari; sed dari secundum ipsius secretissimam, eandemque justissimam, sapientissimam, beneficentissimamque voluntatem.*—*Ibid.* c. xiii. (82, 83).

NOTICES.

'THE Delegates of the Press,' at Oxford, have just favoured the reading public with an edition of 'Burnet's Life of Hale and Fell's Life of Hammond.' Unfortunately the book is priced at twice its market value, and the University authorities have, at the same time, contrived to make it valueless, by selecting the worst edition of the 'Life of Hammond' from which to make their reprint. The Delegates of late seem to have been influenced but by one motive, that of wasting the funds at their command upon republishing books neither scarce nor valuable. With the exception of Le Neve's 'Fasti,' and the recent 'Bingham,' scarcely any book has of late issued from the Oxford press which was worth reprinting, or which might not better have been left to the ordinary channels of publication. 'Carte's Life of Ormond,' 'Burnet's Lives of the Dukes of Hamilton,' 'Smalridge's Sermons,' and such ware, are surely not the class of books which we have a right to expect from the Oxford Delegates. We protest against this waste of trust funds. Such, if any such there be, as wished for a book like Smalridge, might on any day, from the shelves of the second-hand booksellers of London, collect fifty copies. We have seen a large handsomely bound folio copy sold for eighteen-pence. But not only do the Oxford Delegates reprint worthless books, but their editions of good books are much below the mark. A few years hence, in despair, the Delegates of the Press will sell for waste paper what the present Delegates have wasted the money of the University upon. The Oxford reprints, which possess in themselves a permanent value, are too often deformed by careless editing. The Clarendon Press edition of Strype's works, for instance, perpetuates almost all the blunders of the old editions. The twenty-one volumes of Strype might have been made of still greater value to historical literature if a careful collation had been undertaken of the records which Strype copied from, and which, from insufficient acquaintance with ancient MSS., he too often copied inaccurately. We have surely a right to expect that the Delegates of the Clarendon Press will turn their thoughts to works of too slow a sale to be remunerative to booksellers, and at the same time of such lasting value as to make their republication a real boon. Why should not the University commission a competent Editor to prepare an amended edition of 'Wilkins' Concilia,' with such a supplement as additional researches might enable him to give? Or again, why should not the Delegates make some effort to publish an 'Anglia Sacra' worthy of the Church? Countless are the treasures which lie buried on the shelves of the College and University libraries in Oxford. An accidental fire may make us deplore the loss of what is as completely disregarded as if they had already perished. Several times we have been promised the publication of the 'Theological Dictionary of Gascoigne,' a solitary MS. of which is in existence, and that in a College library at Oxford. It contains the most authentic materials for the history of the English Church during the dreary interval from Edward the Third to Henry the Sixth. Literary societies, however, have not found this work of sufficient general

interest to justify their undertaking its publication; but surely the University might and ought to cause such MSS. to be no longer the mere literary lumber of College libraries. When an attempt shall have been made, and perhaps with success, by the Heywood of the future, to seize the funds now so sadly misused, we shall hear lamentations of what might have been done, and shall have to deplore that so little was really effected by the Oxford Delegates.

It is only courteous to acknowledge the sort of compliment which Mr. Brudenell Barter, in the preface to a 'Postscript' to his tract on the 'Progress of Infidelity,' (Rivingtons,) pays to the literary acquirements of the writers in this Review: this recognition, however, is balanced by an offence against truth, which in other days one so just, as well as warm-hearted, as Mr. Brudenell Barter would not have committed. Is there no true friend to remind the Rector of Highclere of the Archbishop of Granada? If Mr. Barter considers our recent strictures on the Chevalier Bunsen, on Dr. Donaldson, Professor Jowett, and Mr. Stanley, 'long and complimentary,' we can only say that our own view and that of Mr. Barter as to 'complimentary' criticism differs. However, to pursue the subject would be unkind and ungracious. To those who have read Mr. Barter's pamphlet, we shall have to assign no reasons for declining to enter into a dispute with one whom we cannot but deeply respect; while to those who are strangers to this publication, we gladly leave the remembrance of a warm-hearted and dutiful clergyman, who in his day has done service to the Church, whose ministry he has by his life adorned.

There seems to be a desperate disturbance in the ranks of Dissent. The outward form of the present heart-searchings is contemptible and even ludicrous. A Mr. Lynch publishes a small volume of poetry, called the 'Rivulet.' As far as we can judge from extracts—for in the course of the controversy almost the whole volume has been produced—name and matter tolerably agree. Mr. Lynch's little stream glides glibly along: it is not very deep nor very picturesque, but pretty and at least colourless. The 'Eclectic Review' praises the volume; when, much to the surprise of the religious world, the pothouse journal, the notorious 'Morning Advertiser,' the paper owned by the publicans, and whose specialty is the prize-fight and the turf prophecy, the organ of the licensed victuallers and the ring, in the name of dissenting orthodoxy denounces Mr. Lynch and the 'Eclectic' as unevangelical. Fifteen dissenting teachers, and some of them certainly men of note in their way—such as Mr. Newman Hall, Mr. Binney, and Dr. Vaughan—come forward with a testimonial to Mr. Lynch's orthodoxy and the soundness of the inculcated versicles. Nothing daunted by this theological phalanx, but of course pleased with the good luck which had turned him into the Athanasius of the occasion, Mr. James Grant, Editor of the 'Morning Advertiser,' fires away article after article, in his own newspaper, of the most rampant and truculent abuse of Mr. Lynch and dissenting teachers in general; which articles he reprints in an ugly pamphlet, 'The Controversy on important Theological Questions,' &c. (Collingridge,) of which, so he assures us, the sale is immense and the popularity unbounded. That is to say, Dissenters have greater confidence in the theological powers of the distinguished author of 'The

Great Metropolis,' than in their chosen pastors. The 'Patriot,' newspaper, which is, we believe, the dissenting organ, not caring to be unceremoniously ousted from its accredited post of literary theologian to the three denominations, defends Mr. Lynch, not without a reasonable growl at its brother 'the Tiser.' Whereupon one 'John Campbell, D.D.' Editor of a rival dissenting print, called the 'British Banner,' of course because the 'Patriot' takes one side, takes the other, and publishes 'Seven Letters on Nonconformist Theology,' written in a style which we should consider as simply savage. The 'Record,' true to its affinities, joins battle on the side of the 'Morning Advertiser;' and as the conflict widens so it deepens in scurrility and bitterness. *Non nostrum est*: and to the parties most immediately concerned our judgment would go for nothing: but such as it is we volunteer it. The 'Rivulet' we consider an inoffensive publication, but from its mere prettiness and sentimentality rather unfitted for 'congregational purposes;' at least we should consider them very irreligious congregations which addressed Almighty God with such commonplace maunderings as Mr. Lynch's. The controversy has, however, brought out this, that the disorganization of Dissent is complete, and that in the breaking up of its old traditions, nonconformity is in many influential quarters not unjustly suspected of rationalizing tendencies. But that any system can only find its defenders of the faith in such champions as Dr. Campbell and Mr. James Grant, is a slur on its intellectual and moral capacity, which evangelical dissent has yet to account for. Meanwhile indirect advantages to truth are spreading: Mr. Binney publishes a pamphlet in favour of liturgies: and not content with building Gothic chapels, we now hear of congregations adopting regular Prayer-books and chanting as signs of an improved tone among Dissenters. The representative of the old narrow-minded prejudices is the young conceited fanatic Mr. Spurgeon, whose devotees denounce all dissenting preachers but their oracle, as unfaithful to the Gospel. While, partly from envy and partly from higher motives, the ministers generally seem to consider the new Whitfield as a charlatan. Out of this chaos, however, we can only anticipate great gains to the Church and to Divine truth, if in a serious as well as loving spirit we can contrive to show in this Agramant's camp of divided sects and failing religionism a purer and more perfect way.

Ludicrous as is the attitude taken by the 'Morning Advertiser,' it is not more absurd than the position chosen for Lord Palmerston, by Mr. J. W. Lester. This gentleman indites a letter to the Premier, under the title of 'Suggestions for Increasing the Efficiency of the Church of England,' (Heylin,) an object which the genial Viscount has of course shown to lie very near his heart. Mr. Lester's suggestions are to shorten the service by 'omitting the Litany, the Chants, and the pre-Communion Service,' whatever that ritual peculiarity may be, and 'to grant permission to clergymen of the English Church to allow Ministers of orthodox churches,—Presbyterian, Wesleyan, Independent, Baptist, and Free Kirk ministers,—to occupy occasionally their pulpits.'

Mr. Maw Shaw, Curate of Highgate, in a 'Letter,' (Rivingtons,) addressed to, but not inserted in, a newspaper, has done much to prejudice Churchmen against the amiable and excellent scheme for 'promoting union between

the Church and Wesleyans.' This gentleman characterises the Wesleyans as 'equals,' and is content to view 'the reordination' of Wesleyan ministers, not as conferring on them any gift or privilege which they had not before, but only on their part 'as an act of conformity,' rather than of submission. Deference to, that is, an exclusive recognition of the Apostolical Succession, the Curate of Highgate, with a feeble effort at fun, stigmatises as 'wrapping up ourselves in our warm comforters and 'high Church cloaks, our exclusiveness and stateliness, and such like 'nonsensical vanities, in deference to the wishes of the most Christian 'nabobs of this world.' A more foolish and ignorant pamphlet we have not seen for some time; and we regret it the more as it gives force to much of the injudicious language which some adherents of the scheme, with whose hearts we have more sympathy than with their heads, are in the habit of using. This, at any rate, *we* can afford to say, as our pages were the first to inculcate the possibility of incorporating Wesleyanism into the Church: but this let us add, with an estimate of the Church very different from any which has yet possessed itself of Mr. Maw Shaw.

Some of our Readers may remember a book which came out about a couple of seasons since, with the rather clumsy title of a 'Glance behind the Grilles of French Religious Houses,' and professed to be the narrative of a tour to Paris and back again, undertaken with a view to studying the religious system of the country, by a Clergyman of the Church of England. With strong Romanising tendencies, the author still maintained the character of a devoted member of our communion, and paraded what professed to be allusions to his own work in his own parish. Our anonymous traveller has just brought out a sequel volume upon Belgium, called 'Flemish Interiors.' (Longman.) We were not a little surprised on opening the book to find all disguise thrown off, and without the slightest intimation being given of any intermediate change, the author talking purely and simply in the character of a Romanist, entitling Dr. Manning the Apostle of England, and so on. If the real condition of the author were what it proclaimed itself in the 'Grilles,' such a trick would have been sufficiently discreditable; but we cannot help suspecting that the two books carry with them the additional disingenuousness of being a romance, if anything so wire-drawn and colourless can be designated by that appellation. Internal evidence points to the writing being not that of a clergyman or even a layman, but of a woman. How far the Anglican colouring of the first volume was part of the machinery we do not pretend to surmise, nor to bestow any detailed examination on the second work. In a merely literary aspect, it is notably inferior to its predecessor. Its facts are discursive and ill-marshalled, while the lighter portions are simply twaddle. Besides the moral harm which works of this sort occasion, they carry with them the additional disadvantage of forestalling the market against really sterling publications. There is no book which, if well done, would be more interesting and useful than a really sensible and dispassionate examination of the religious condition of our continental neighbours by an English Churchman, combining orthodoxy of belief with knowledge of the world, and acquaintance with ecclesiastical history. It is strange that with so full a Church literature as we possess no one has

produced this desideratum. In the present work we see what the book ought not to be.

A fresh proof of the reaction in favour of moderate or Gallican views in France, which the audacious assumptions of Ultramontaniam in late years has aroused, and of which reaction the '*Observateur Catholique*' is the type, is afforded in the '*Essai sur la Réforme Catholique*, par MM. Bordas Dumoulin et F. Huet.' (Paris: Chamcrot.) The volume, as its title implies, is a collection of separate essays on various Church matters, written at different periods, by the authors; who combine, in a remarkably fearless and outspoken way, the profession of strong political liberalism, with a zeal for the searching reform of the Roman Catholic Church on a Gallican basis. The Immaculate Conception forms the specialty of the third and concluding part of the volume, with a particular reference to Cardinal Gousset's treatise in favour of the fashionable view. Our authors condense in the body of the work some very interesting information on a by-passage of ecclesiastical history, almost unknown in England, the later days of the Constitutional Church of France, an establishment which we are accustomed to look at in the light of the apostasies of a Talleyrand and a Gobel. MM. Bordas Dumoulin and Huet introduce us to a later period, after the persecutions had consumed the chaff, and the restoration of comparative political quiet permitted a return to social and religious organization. We then find the constitutional Church, with the tacit sanction of the Directory, engaged, under much poverty, in the religious cure of France, with an episcopate completely organized, not only over the country itself, but in the French colonies. Nay, we see it, in spite of the frowns of the Pope, actually holding two National Councils within the walls of Notre Dame, in 1797 and in 1801, with all the formalities requisite to give sanction to their acts, which were chiefly directed to measures of practical reform, and of the accommodation of the Church's system to a republican polity in the State. The leading spirit of this second period of the Constitutional Church was Gregoire, the Bishop of Blois, who is the hero of our authors' admiration, and whom they energetically defend from the charge of having voted for the death of Louis XVI., though it is certain that he voted for his punishment. The republican prelate shows in a more favourable light after he had retired from politics, having, at much risk to his personal safety, publicly refused to renounce his orders, after the example of Gobel, and devoted himself, in his character of constitutional Bishop, to the charge of his diocese. It was quite a possibility at one time, when Bonaparte determined to restore national religion, that he might have recognised the constitutional Church. However, the Pope adopted a concordat, framed on easy terms for the new ruler, and Ultramontaniam at last prevailed in France, twelve of the constitutional Bishops having their consecrations confirmed, and being incorporated into the new hierarchy, though with different sees. Gregoire, with characteristic obstinacy, refused to the latest days of his long life, which lasted down to Louis Philippe's reign, to enter into the new state of things, and continued to assert the legitimacy of his episcopal mission. Visiting England during the peace of Amiens, he wore his violet dress in St. James's Park, and boasted that he was the first Roman Catholic Bishop who had dared so to do since the time of James II.

The late Dr. Mill's 'Lectures on the Catechism,' (Deighton, Bell & Co.) are just what might be expected from the well-known learning and moderation of their author. It was his custom, as we learn from the prefatory notice of this volume, to catechise daily in church after morning prayer the children of his parish schools; and on Sunday afternoons his catechetical class embraced all the young members of his flock who could be induced to attend. On these more formal occasions he substituted for the sermon a short address, in which he recapitulated the substance of his previous oral instruction. From these addresses his son-in-law, Mr. Webb, has compiled a series of lectures which follows the course of the Church Catechism; and the volume strikes us as being likely to be useful not only to such parish priests as may need guidance in what is by no means the easiest part of their duty, but to all who are entrusted with the religious education of the young. To sponsors especially a work like this may be recommended as a most suitable present to their godchildren. There is no task, perhaps, more difficult than to present the mysteries of the Christian faith in simple and intelligible language to the minds of children. It requires a profound knowledge of the subject in order to be a good catechiser. In no branch of science is it more true than in theology that the teacher must be himself not a learner. It is a strange practical error of these days that religious instruction is so generally imparted in the ordinary Sunday schools by those who ought themselves to be the members of a catechetical class. We have heard it said by a shrewd observer, that if he knew a single church in London where a sermon was addressed in plain earnest language, by a competent theologian, to a class of children, he would go to hear no other preacher. We will not say that Dr. Mill in the present lectures never rises above the level of his audience; but certainly many of them are eminently simple, and lucid, and intelligible. His style here is characteristically like that of his greater works, and yet, unlike them, remarkably free from obscurities or involutions. The language is vigorous, but grave and unaffected, occasionally rising into passages of much warmth and eloquence. As to matter, no one who knew the author will need to be told that the doctrine of the Incarnation forms the key-note, as it were, of the whole series. Especially useful are the practical refutations of many of the more common errors of popular religionism. In particular it is shown, over and over again, how impossible it is to divorce the doctrine of the Atonement from that of the Incarnation, to exalt one part of the Creed above the other, and to view the meritorious death of our Lord apart from His nativity, His resurrection, or exaltation. Again, the vulgar use of the word 'Jehovah,' as a proper name, is most earnestly reprobated; and it is pointed out that in truth this incommunicable name is involved in that Holy Name of the New Covenant at which every knee shall bow. The concluding Lecture, on the Doctrine of the Eucharist, is, perhaps, the most remarkable of the series. We subjoin two extracts, interesting for their uncompromising antagonism to two opposite errors of the present day. First, as to the Immaculate Conception:—

It should inspire us also with a reverent admiration of the Blessed Person who was thus divinely and pre-eminently favoured; and that without forgetting that the favour was, through her, to the whole human

'family, with whom the Son of God has thus assumed kindred and relationship. As the person of Christ is one and indivisible, and what He was as man and in His human nature, are the acts and properties of God; therefore the Blessed Virgin, though Christ's mother only as to His humanity, is truly called the "mother of God," as the ancient Church declared at the Council of Ephesus, in its care to guard against all heresy as to our Lord's person. Let us therefore honour her and all saints in their proper place, being careful, at the same time, not to ascribe to any of them any of the attributes of Christ's humanity, such as freedom from original sin. From this birth-sin the Virgin-born Saviour was indeed free, as it was impossible that He should be contaminated with it; but none other born of woman beside Him. "Thou only art holy; Thou only art the Lord;" is the voice of the Church in the angelic hymn that is sung at the Holy Communion. No other was free from our race's sin, but He who alone expiated it—the Incarnate Son of God."—Pp. 78, 79.

And again, with reference to the proper observance of Sunday:—

'Still the error is far from harmless which gives to this holy feast of Christ's resurrection a character so unlike that which it legitimately bears under the Christian dispensation; which instructs people to regard it in much the same light in which earnest Christians of the old stamp observe the great fasts of the year, such as Ash Wednesday or Good Friday; which seems to make the sanctification of the day to consist in a sombre proscription of the kind of cheerfulness which would be innocent on ordinary days. This is utterly unlike the religion of the Old Testament as well as of the New; unlike the Jewish Sabbath as well as the Christian's Lord's-day. Any person may observe that some of our Lord's works of mercy, performed on the Sabbath day, was performed at the houses of Pharisees or others where He was entertained at dinner. This social assembling was without offence on either side; the sole objection of His hypocritical enemies was to anything that bore the semblance of work. Our business on this day is to abstain from worldly work in a far different spirit from theirs; not as if the rest, as rest, were a divine service, in imitation of the rest of the Creator; but that our powers and faculties may be more freely employed on the blessed contemplation of His religion, who has opened to us everlasting life. And the more cheerful that contemplation is felt to be by us, the more healthy are our souls.'—Pp. 119, 120.

A well-reasoned Sermon was delivered at the Bishop of Oxford's recent Ordination by Mr. H. J. Pye, of Clifton Campville, and has been published by Masters, under the title, 'The Teacher sent from God.' It deals with the favourite and, we may add, hackneyed difficulty, that the Church of England claims at once to be general and particular, and delivers her doctrines with authority and at the same time as private conclusions. Mr. Pye makes out with precision the abstract and relative character of a particular Church as regards both an undivided condition and a state of schism. Besides the general argument, which is tersely put, there are some very serious and solemn observations on the personal duties of the clergy.

The Ecclesiological Society has at length completed the series—or rather a second series—of that useful and important work, '*Instrumenta Ecclesiastica*,' (Van Voorst,) a collection of working drawings of church furniture, fittings, and the general apparatus of divine worship. Although the work is intended chiefly for the colonies and remote districts, yet by the purity of the designs the principles of Christian art may be profitably studied in this manual. From the nature of the case great simplicity in construction has been aimed at: and we are glad to see that the Society to which more than any existing body the revival of Church Architecture in this country is owing, far from stagnating, seems to be animated with a practical and liberal desire to incorporate into the service of the sanctuary every advance in construction or new adaptation of materials. The last number of the series contains designs for an Iron Church, in which, though perhaps we think that we discover rather the predominance of an attempt merely to translate a stone construction into metal-work, yet there is displayed this laudable desire to keep the Church's work up to the discoveries and requirements of the age. Not, as it seems, that an iron church or palace is, after all, such a discovery: Statius literally describes it:—

* Ferrea compago laterum, ferro arcta teruntur

* Limina, ferratis incumbunt tecta columnis.'

Mr. J. H. Parker has published a series of '*Cottage Prints*,' from Scripture subjects, which, from their boldness of colour and decision of design, seem likely to rival with success in general effect, while they exceed in didactic purposes, those rough and irreligious daubs which are to be found in most of our villages. We have to thank Mr. Parker for this attempt, which has considerable success; and perhaps we have not yet realized how important an element of religious instruction to the poor consists in these common prints. As there is a print, and generally a Scripture-print, in the poorest room, it is of some consequence to see that it teaches a good lesson.

A second volume of that important and practical history, the '*Annals of England*,' has just reached us from Mr. J. H. Parker, which for use in the better class of schools we recommend highly.

'*Disciplina Rediviva*,' (Bell & Daldy,) is the title of a series of Essays by Mr. Gilderdale, originally contributed to the '*Journal of Education*.' It consists of advice to young men in reading, and forms, as it were, a skeleton map of the world of letters. But it is more than this. Mr. Gilderdale has read largely, and he writes of his own reading in a pleasant genial tone, occasionally reminding us of Lamb, or even of Walton, with better feeling and principles than the one, and a higher scholarship than the other. Merely as a collection of literary recollections this volume deserves to take a permanent rank.

[P.S. Many of our short Notices are, from the length of our Articles in the present Quarter, unavoidably postponed.—ED. C. R.]

INDEX TO VOL. XXXI.

(NEW SERIES.)

ARTICLES AND SUBJECTS.

B.

Bohlen, von, on Genesis (*see* Heywood).

C.

Canons of Historic Credibility [Cornwall Lewis, *Early Roman History*], 27—83. Funerary History, 27. Criticism, 28. Historical evidence and legendary history, 29. History based on contemporary evidence which has not become legend, 30—49. History based on contemporary evidence which has become legend, 50—64. History resting on no contemporary evidence, 65—82. Exception of the Inspired Volume, 82, 83.
Cureton's *Spicilegium Syriacum* [*Spicilegium Syriacum*, &c.], 198—250. Why was this publication postponed, 198. Anticipations respecting it, 199. Its contents, 201. Bardeanes on Free Will, 201—218. Syriac Version of Melito's Apology, its doubtful authenticity, 219—236. Fragments of Melito, 236—244. Hypomnemata, 245—246. The Epistle of Mara, 246—249.

D.

Dulwich College [*Dulwich College Statutes*, &c.], 84—131. Dulwich, 84. Its college, 85, 86. Its foundation, 87—90. A charity—a school—a religious house, 91. The statutes, 91. Its purpose, 92—96. Music an object, 97. Early litigation, 98. Recent disputes, 99—114. Its future: the Charity Commissioners, 114—126. Postscript: the Commissioners' revised scheme, 127—131.

NO. XCII.—N.S.

H.

Heywood, Mr. &c. [*Introduction to Genesis*, by P. Von Bohlen, translated, &c.], 309—333. Change in the characteristics of infidelity, 309. Von Bohlen, 310—311. The translator, Mr. Heywood, 315, 316. Von Bohlen's Prolegomena to Genesis, 316. Analysis and criticism of, 317—332. Mr. Heywood's motion on Bible Version, 333.

J.

Jowett on the Epistles, &c. [*Stanley on the Corinthians*, &c., *Jowett on the Thessalonians*, &c.], 445—492. Connexion of the two writers, 445. Their respective peculiarities and tempers, 446. Mr. Stanley incapable of the critical function, 447. His merits, 448, 449. His taste for historical analogy, 450. His literary faults, 451—453. His errors in doctrine, 454; and criticism, 455—458. Mr. Jowett—plan of his work, 459; and its contents, 459, 460; its dangerous and unsatisfactory character; its vagueness and heresy shown, 460—492.

L.

Lee, Mr. [*Lectures on Inspiration*, &c.], 1—26. A valuable work, 1. What is the bearing of an inquiry on Inspiration, 1. Is a theory of Inspiration possible? 2. Consequences of resting Christianity on this question, 3. Difficulties not in the essays of those who do not believe in Inspiration, but in our mistaking the question, 5. Testimony, 6. Historical belief, 7. The proof coeval with the fact, 8—12. Criticism and character of Mr. Lee's work, 12—26.

Lushington, Dr. (*Judgment in Consistorial Court*, &c.), 251—260. Organization of Churchmen, 252. St. Barnabas, Pimlico, 253. Character of Dr. Lushington's Judgment, 264. What is servile imitation of Rome? 255, 256. The Cross, 257, 258. Reasons for an appeal, 259—260.

M.

Macaulay [*History of England from the Accession of James II.* Vols. iii. and iv.] 377—429. Agreement of the critics, 377. Macaulay's partiality, 378—382. William III. his character, 382—387. The England of that day, 389—402. Marlborough, 403. Shrewsbury, 404—408. Fenwick's trial, 409—413. The Non-jurors, 414—424. The Currency, 424—428. Conclusion, 429.

Maua Race, The [*Grey's Polynesian Mythology*—*Taylor's Te Tka a Mauti*], 430—444. The Polynesian Race, 430. Traditions, 431. Sir George Grey, 432. The Polynesian Mythology—Specimens of, 434—437. Mr. Taylor's origin of the New Zealanders, 438. The Maori, 439. History, 439—443. Church prospects, 444.

Mozley on Predestination [*The Augustinian Doctrine of Predestination*], 132—197. Character of the work, 132. Predestination and Fatalism, 133, 134. Philosophical Fatalism, 135. Theological Predestination, 136—139. Pelagius, 140; his works, 141—148. Opposition to Pelagius, 149. Semi-Pelagianism, 150. History of the controversy, and illustrations from Mr. Mozley's work, 150—196. Dangers of Mr. Mozley's view in connexion with Spiritual Regeneration, 196, 197.

N.

Newton, Life of [*Peacock's Life of Young—Brewster's Life of Newton*, &c.], 334—376. Lives of men of science, 334. Unequal character of the two biographies, 335. Dr. Young and Dr. Peacock's admirable biography, 336—340. Life of Newton, 340. Sir D. Brewster, 340, 341. Newton's biography, 343, 344. Predecessors of Newton, 345. Galileo, 346—348. Kepler, 349—351. Huyghens, 352, 353. Newton's scientific character, 354—364. His moral and religious opinions, 365—376.

P.

Poetry of 1855 [*Poetry by Longfellow, Tennyson, Browning, Bailey*, &c.], 267—308. Unexpected character of recent poetry, Maud, 267—269. *Hiawatha*, 270—281. Browning's Men and Women, 281—294. Bailey's Mystic, 295—298. Michell's Poetry of Creation, 299—300. Ernest Jones's poems, 301—304. Lushington's War Poems, 304, 305. Peace in War, 306. General reflections, 307, 308.

S.

Stanley on the Corinthians (*see* Jowett).

Y.

Young, Dr., Life of (*see* Newton).

SHORTER NOTICES OF BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS.

JANUARY.—Bishop Plunket's Charge—Primary Charges by Bishops of Salisbury and Lincoln—Church Almanacs by Parker, Masters, Cleaver, &c.—Kahn's German Protestantism—Kay's Promises of Christianity—Guthrie on Ezekiel—Everley—Eden's Sermons—The Sampler—Archer Gurney's Poems—Mrs. Boss's Niece—Paget's Tales—The Owllet of Owlstone Edge—Beauty of Holiness, &c.—West's Sermons—Gowling's Sermons—Millman's Latin Christianity—Macculay's History—Pusey's Two Sermons—Laud's Devotions—Spinckes' Devotions—Rostle's Longfellow's Poems—Gresley's Three Sermons—Life of Alderman Kelly—Krummacher's Suffering Saviour—Dr. Lushington's Judgment—History of Sir Thomas Thumb—Blatch's Memoir of Bishop Low—Hewitt's Ancient Armour.

APRIL.—Birks on Difficulties of Belief—Penrose on Faith and Practice—Dorothy—Selections from Cleveland Pealter—Anderson's Colonial Church—Jelf's Edition of the Ethics—Church Poetry—Singer's Shakespeare—Nugee's Holy Women of Gospel, and Lent Lectures—Hicks on Baptism—Adams' Allegories—Kingsley's Heroes—Ford on the Acts—Hymnals—Gurney's Sermons—Practical Sermons on O. T.—Donaldson on Classical Scholarship—F. Newman's Homer's Iliad—Hand-Book to the Aquarium—Stanley's Sinai and Palestine—Week of Darkness—Letters of S. Francis of Sales—Sketches on Italy—Coxe's Impressions of England—Hardwick's Church History—Ald's Poems—Family

Prayer—Robinson's Catechism of Rome—Byrne's Lectures—Scudamore on Communion of Laity—Braham's Philebus—Hare's Charges—Lord A. Hervey on Inspiration—Kennaway's Hulsean Prize Essay—Cralk's Search after Truth—Nunn's Sermons—Churchwarden's Manual—Dialogues on Universal Restitution—Evening of Life—Chambers on Lushington's Judgment—Denison's Translation of Julius Cæsar—Blaw's Agatheion—Parminster on Grammar—Nind's German Poetry—Kennaway's Lecture—Micrographic Dictionary—Literary Churchman—Elliott, Neale, and Gresley—Bishop of Oxford and Mr. Carter on Penitentiaries—Farber's Catechism—Gory Wyse's Gallican Liturgies—Sermons by Goulburn, Baring, Bernard, Heurtley, Hussey, &c. on the Apocalypse—Sunday Trading in London—Alford's Letters to Spelling—Heurtley on the Lord's Day—Malan on Chinese Primers—Jervis on Poor Clergy Question—Sermons on Ritual, by Skinner and Flower—Lee on Increase of the Episcopate—Mackenzie's Ordination Sermon—Moodie on Cathedrals—Bowers' Sermon—Harrington on Pope Pius IV. and C. P. Book—Neale and Chase on Oxford Studies and Statutes—L'Observateur Catholique—Lea's History of Chartres' recent Works—Keane's Lenten Offering—Tracts for the present Crisis—Newland on Seasons of the Church—Ridley's Confirmation Papers—Paget's Tales—Montalembert on England—Beresford Hope's Lecture—Fleury's Lecture—Sermons by Alford, Hill, Copner, Heffernan, Bosanquet, Bishop Perry, &c.

